

UNIVERSITY OF HAWAI'I LIBRARY

SCHISM, ORTHODOXY AND HERESY IN THE HISTORY OF TENRIKYŌ:  
THREE CASE STUDIES

A THESIS SUBMITTED TO THE GRADUATE DIVISION OF THE  
UNIVERSITY OF HAWAI'I IN PARTIAL FULFILLMENT  
OF THE REQUIREMENTS FOR THE DEGREE OF

MASTER OF ARTS

IN

RELIGION (ASIAN)

MAY 2005

By  
Roy Tetsuo Forbes

Thesis Committee:

Helen J. Baroni, Chairperson

George J. Tanabe Jr.

Robert N. Huey

Copyright © 2005 by Roy Tetsuo Forbes  
All rights reserved.

This thesis is dedicated to my mother Sumako, my late father Robert and the late Reverend Nakata Kaname.

— Acknowledgements —

Although there were numerous individuals who helped me in various tangible and intangible ways throughout the span of my research, I would like to name and express my appreciation to a select few. First of all, I wish to thank the professors of my thesis committee—Dr. Helen Baroni, Dr. George Tanabe and Dr. Robert Huey—for their advice and assistance throughout the course of my research. Next, I would like to voice my appreciation toward Bishop Hamada Michihito of the Tenrikyo Mission Headquarters of Hawaii (Dendocho) for helping jumpstart my studies on Tenrikyō by introducing me to various sources that proved indispensable in the writing of this thesis. I also thank Mr. Tabayashi Hiroaki of the Tenrikyo Overseas Department for being my main contact in Tenri City who helped arrange an informal, introductory tour at Tenri Central Library. I further appreciate Mr. Tabayashi for driving me to Sukezō's residence in Harigabessho and to Ōyamato Jinja on his precious days off. Last but not least, I thank the patient staff members at Tenri Central Library, Tenri Bunko in Nu'uano, and of Hawaii Dendocho for allowing me to raid their respective collections on more than one occasion.

— Abstract —

The Japanese ‘new religion’ Tenrikyō, founded by Nakayama Miki (1798-1887) in the late Tokugawa era, is arguably the largest of the thirteen Kyōha Shintō (‘Sect Shinto’) groups that trace their institutional origins to the Meiji period. Under the joint leadership of Iburi Izō (1833-1907) and Miki’s grandson Nakayama Shinnosuke (1866-1914), Tenrikyō grew from a sparse collection of *kō* (religious confraternities) into a vast institutional network of branch churches within ten years of Miki’s death due to the aggressive propagation efforts of its first generation missionaries. This thesis surveys the historical, sociological and ideological contexts that surrounded the emergence of three schisms—Tenrin-Ō-Kyōkai, Daidōkyō, and Honmichi—which occurred at three separate stages within Tenrikyō’s transition from a small rural movement into a nationwide phenomenon. Despite the differences in the historical backdrops of these three schisms, themes of sacred space and charismatic authority were central issues in the emergence of each.

— Contents—

Acknowledgements .....	v
Abstract .....	vi
Abbreviations .....	ix
Note on citations .....	x
 Introduction .....	 1
A short history of the Tenrikyō institution .....	4
Basic methodological considerations .....	12
The 'raw materials' of schism:	
Social tension, organizational conditions, and state regulation ....	15
The issue of legitimate authority:	
Charisma and the implications surrounding its routinization .....	20
The centrality of sacred space and person in Tenrikyō orthodoxy ...	24
Organization of chapters .....	26
 Chapter One	
The Emergence of Tenrikyō and the Sukezō Jiken .....	29
The initiation of the obiya-yurushi .....	32
Evolution from 'client cult' to 'cult movement':	
The conversion of Yamanaka, Iburi, and Yamazawa .....	35
The ' <i>Ōyamato Jinja no fushi</i> ' and its implications .....	37
The Sukezō jiken .....	41
Implications of the Sukezō jiken .....	53
Tenrikyō under the sanction of Yoshida Shintō .....	56
The impact of Meiji religious policy on Shugendō and Tenrikyō .....	58
Chapter conclusion .....	65

## Chapter Two

Heresy During the Watch of Honseki Iburi Izō: The Mizu-yashiki Jiken ....	69
Miki's 'withdrawal from physical life':	
The passing of the charismatic mantle to Iburi Izō .....	74
Tenrikyō orthodoxy under Iburi Izō	
and the concept of the Jiba in the <i>Osashizu</i> .....	77
The Secret Directives and their implications .....	84
The early life of Iida Iwajirō .....	92
Iwajirō's kamigakari experiences .....	97
The Mizu-yashiki jiken in the <i>Osashizu</i> .....	102
Implications of the Mizu-yashiki jiken .....	107
Chapter conclusion .....	112

## Chapter Three

'Opening of the Lid': The Emergence of Tenri Kenkyūkai .....	115
The drive toward sectarian independence .....	118
The early life of Ōnishi Aijirō .....	123
'Kanrodai nin no o-fumitome': Aijirō's revelatory experience .....	127
The founding of the Tenri Kenkyūkai .....	132
Tenrikyō in transition:	
The passing of Iburi Izō and Nakayama Shinnosuke .....	134
The expectation of the return of revelation in Tenrikyō .....	136
The writings of Masuno Kosetsu .....	137
Conversion data of four Tenri Kenkyūkai members .....	141
Factors contributing to the appeal of the Tenri Kenkyūkai .....	145
Implications of the emergence of Tenri Kenkyūkai (Honmichi) .....	153
Chapter conclusion .....	157
Conclusion .....	160
Bibliography .....	181

— Abbreviations —

- A Tenrikyo Church Headquarters. *Anecdotes of Oyasama the Foundress of Tenrikyo*
- D Tenrikyo Church Headquarters. *The Doctrine of Tenrikyo*
- DK Yamazawa Ryōsuke. *Doroumi kōki, Meiji jūyo-nen wakatai-bon*
- HG Honmichi Kyōgibu. *Honmichi gaikan*
- IH Tenrikyō Kyōkai Honbu, ed. *Kōhon Tenrikyō Kyōsoden itsuwa-hen*
- KNH Tenrikyō Seinenkai Shiryō chōsa-han. “Kyōsoden shiryō no kentō:  
*Nakayama Miki kenkyū nōto hihan*”
- KTk Tenrikyō Kyōkai Honbu. *Kōhon Tenrikyō Kyōsoden*
- LO Tenrikyo Church Headquarters. *Life of Oyasama, the Foundress of Tenrikyo*
- MKU *Mikagura-uta*
- MKZ *Masuno Kosetsu zenshū*
- NSD Tenrikyō Kyōgi oyobi Shiryō Shūsei-bu, ed. *Nakayama Shinnosuke den*
- NSSS *Nihon shomin seikatsu shiryō shūsei, dai jū-hachi kan* (vol. 18): *minkan shūkyō*
- Of Tenrikyo Church Headquarters. *Ofudesaki: English, Japanese and romanization*
- Os Tenrikyō Kyōgi oyobi Shiryō Shūsei-bu, ed. *Osashizu*
- OYKH Nakayama Shinnosuke. *Okina yori kikishi hanashi*
- SKJJ Inoue Nobutaka et al., ed. *Shinshūkyō kyōdan, jinbutsu jiten*
- SJ Inoue Nobutaka et al. ed. *Shinshūkyō jiten*
- TJ Tenri Daigaku Oyasato Kenkyūsho, ed. *Kaitei Tenrikyō jiten*
- TJKH Tenri Daigaku Oyasato Kenkyūsho, ed. *Kaitei Tenrikyō jiten: kyōkaishi-hen*
- TKSS Tenri Daigaku Shūkyō Bunka Kenkyūsho, ed. *Tenrikyō kyōkai shi shiryō*
- TOD Tenrikyo Overseas Department (see bibliography for sources)
- TOMD Tenrikyo Overseas Mission Department (see bibliography for sources)  
\*note: the Tenrikyo Overseas Mission Department (Kaigai Dendōbu) was  
renamed the Tenrikyo Overseas Department (Kaigaibu) in April 1999
- TTDS *Tenrikyō Takayasu Daikyōkai shi*, revised edition



— Note on citations —

I have chosen to follow the conventional Tenrikyō style of citing the *Mikagura-uta* and the *Ofudesaki* in this paper. A Roman numeral will respectively indicate the *Mikagura-uta* song and part of the *Ofudesaki*; the Arabic numeral indicates the verse number of each. For the *Osashizu*, I will introduce a new citation style in hopes it will lessen the difficulty of exploring the original documents: the first Arabic numeral will indicate the volume, followed by Arabic page number (as opposed to the Chinese character page numbers). It will then be followed by the Meiji year of the passage; Western calendar year in brackets; followed lastly by month and date. As an example, the first passage of the *Osashizu* would be cited as: (Os 1:1, Meiji 20 [1887] January 4).

— Introduction —

The Japanese ‘new religion’ Tenrikyō 天理教, founded by Nakayama Miki 中山みき (1798-1887), the wife of a relatively wealthy landowning farmer in the Bakumatsu or late Tokugawa era (1600-1867), is arguably one of the more ‘successful’ of the thirteen Kyōha Shintō 教派神道 groups that trace their institutional origins to the Meiji period (1868-1912).<sup>1</sup> While it appears unlikely at the moment for Tenrikyō to eventually measure to the standard of ‘success’ established by sociologist Rodney Stark<sup>2</sup> considering that its growth has long leveled off, the case can be made that Tenrikyō has surpassed the other Kyōha Shintō organizations in both its membership size and the extent of its influence. An acknowledged scholar of Japanese religions has noted, “Tenrikyō was a pioneer New Religion, the first to succeed on a large scale, and served as a model for later movements” (Earhart 1982, 172). An inevitable result of Tenrikyō’s ‘success’ was the emergence of a number of schismatic movements it helped initiate.

This work will survey the social and ideological contexts that surrounded the emergence of three schisms—Tenrin-Ō-Kyōkai 天輪王教会, Daidōkyō 大道教,<sup>3</sup>

---

<sup>1</sup> ‘New religions’ (*shin shūkyō*) will be regarded as “religions that have developed in Japan from the latter Tokugawa era onward outside the mainstream of Shintō and Buddhism, though they incorporate elements from these and other traditions” (Reader and Tanabe 1998 263, n. 1). I shall also use ‘new religious movement(s)’ interchangeably with ‘new religion(s)’ throughout the work.

In addition to Tenrikyō, the remaining Kyōha Shintō organizations are: Kurozumikyō 黒住教, Konkōkyō 金光教, Shintō Honkyoku 神道本局 (now known as Shintō Taikyō 神道大教), Shintō Shūsei-ha 神道修成派, Taishakyō 大社教 (presently Izumo Ōyashirokyō), Fusōkyō 扶桑教, Jikkōkyō 実行教, Shinshūkyō 神習教, Taiseikyō 大成教, Ontakekyō 御嶽教, Misogikyō 禊教, and Shinrikyō 神理教.

<sup>2</sup> Rodney Stark establishes his standard of success “as a continuous variable based on the degree to which a religious movement is able to dominate one or more societies” (1987, 12). While the case can be made that Tenrikyō ‘dominates’ the religious landscape of Tenri City, Tenrikyō would nevertheless fall short of Stark’s standard of success.

<sup>3</sup> Not to be confused with the religious movement of the same name that was founded by Maeda Hidetoshi as a Fusōkyō organization in 1933 whose headquarters is located in Fukui Prefecture.

and Honmichi ほんみち—occurring at three different periods within Tenrikyō's transition from a small rural movement into a nationwide phenomenon. I have specifically chosen to focus on these three schisms for the significance in which they are regarded by the parent body. All three schisms are the organizational remnants of former Tenrikyō members who were expelled for promulgating a version of Nakayama Miki's teachings considered unacceptable to the religious community. In fact, the founder of the Tenrin-Ō-Kyōkai was expelled by Miki herself. Each of the three cases are also explicitly mentioned in the only Tenrikyō treatise I have come across that specifically deals with heresy or '*itan*' (*Itan ni taisuru hihan* or 'Criticism against heresy,' by the late Tenrikyō theologian Ueda Yoshinaru). Again, the same three are mentioned under the entry '*isetsu*'—another term denoting heresy—in the *Tenrikyō jiten* (33-34).

A study on schism and heresy in Tenrikyō's history may not be an obvious topic to many observers of religion in Japan. One reason may stem from the fact that Tenrikyō has, relatively speaking, experienced fewer direct schisms over a longer period of time compared to other new religions such as Reiyūkai 霊友会, Ōmotokyō 大本教, or World Messianity (Sekai Kyūseikyō 世界救世教). According to the *Shinshūkyō kyōdan, jinbutsu jiten*, Tenrikyō has twelve direct schisms.<sup>4</sup> (Of these, only three fall into the category of organizational schisms while the remaining nine are considered as "groups that show a degree of influence from Tenrikyō" which were founded by former members or ministers.) To compare, Reiyūkai (founded in 1828) has twenty-six, Ōmotokyō (1892) has twenty-two, and Sekai Kyūseikyō (1935) has nineteen direct schisms (SKJJ xxviii-

---

<sup>4</sup> The direct schisms that are named in the *Shinshūkyō kyōdan, jinbutsu jiten* that will not be covered in this work include Tenri-Ō Meisei Kyōdan 天輪王明誠教団, Asahi Jinja 朝日神社,

xxii). However, if one were to include the number of schisms that have emerged from Tenrikyō's twelve schisms, this would increase the total substantially, to thirty-one. It must be noted that the existence of these nineteen 'indirect' schisms largely reflects the fragmentary nature the Tenri Kenkyūkai, the precursor of Honmichi, and its numerous schisms rather than any instability on the part of the parent body. Nevertheless, Japanese scholars have noted Tenrikyō's place as a religious organization that has spawned a large number of schisms along with Reiyūkai, Ōmotokyō, and Sekai Kyūseikyō (SJ 64).

Another probable reason that the topic of schism in Tenrikyō has received little attention is that these schisms tend to be limited to small to medium-sized organizations. Tenrikyō thus far has avoided producing a schism that has eclipsed them in size in the manner exhibited by Reiyūkai (i.e., with Risshō Kōsei-kai 立正佼成会) or Ōmotokyō (i.e., with Seichō no Ie 生長の家 and Sekai Kyūseikyō).<sup>5</sup> One possible explanation why Tenrikyō has enjoyed such a degree of stability not seen in other new religions may stem from the institutionalization of the religion based on the doctrine of the Jiba, which stands at the heart of the tradition. In Tenrikyō, the Jiba 地場 has the connotation of meaning *the spot, the place*. Not only is the Jiba the spot where Miki experienced her first *kamigakari* 神懸かり, or the phenomenon of the kami entering her body, it is also considered by adherents to be the location where human beings were created according to Tenrikyō cosmogony. In the routinization process that followed the death of founder Nakayama Miki, the Jiba not only became the soteriological center of the

---

Morality, Taidōkyō 太道教, Shizenshindō 自然真道, Hikawakyō 日月教, Hachirakukai Kyōdan 八楽会教団, Shinkōen 神光苑, and Tenshinkyō Shinyūden Kyōkai 天真教真佑殿教会.

<sup>5</sup> According to 1992 statistics, Reiyūkai claimed 3.2 million members, Risshō Kōsei-kai 6.47 million, Ōmotokyō 170,000, Seichō no Ie 850,000, and Sekai Kyūseikyō 840,000 (Inoue N. 2000, 22).

Tenrikyō faith, it also became the institutional center for the religious organization. In this thesis I would like to make the case that in each of the three examples of schism that will be covered in this work, Tenrikyō's authority of 'place' is either explicitly or implicitly challenged—which essentially represented a threat to the religious authority of Nakayama Miki and her designated heirs.

This study also asks the following questions: What conditions have functioned as the 'raw materials' of schism in Tenrikyō? What specific theological issues were at stake? How did each of these schisms affect the process of Tenrikyō development into a large institution? This study will then look at the manner in which Tenrikyō leadership responded to the heretical views that the founders of these nascent schisms promulgated and analyze the role charisma and its routinization has played in their formation.

### A short history of the Tenrikyō institution

Miki experienced her first *kamigakari* during a Shugendō *yosekaji* 寄加持 rite led by Nakano Ichibei, a renown yamabushi priest in northern Yamato Province (presently Nara Prefecture), in late 1838. While the kami<sup>6</sup> that possessed Miki would eventually come to be called 'God the Parent' (*Oyagami-sama*) or 'Tenri-Ō-no-Mikoto,' it initially identified itself as the 'generalissimo of heaven' (*ten no shōgun*), the 'kami of the Grand Shrine of Ise' (*daijingū*), the true and original kami (*moto no kami*, *jitsu no kami*). The kami expressed the wish to receive Miki as a living shrine (*kami no yashiro*). The *yosekaji* spun out of control as the kami

---

<sup>6</sup> There will be no attempt throughout this paper to differentiate whether 'kami' is singular or plural. I find the grammatical ambiguity of the term to be useful as it is beyond the task of this paper to resolve the theological issue whether Miki and other historical figures viewed their faith to be of a monotheistic or polytheistic variety as both strains have coexisted throughout Tenrikyō's history and continue to do so today.

possessing Miki threatened to destroy the Nakayama home if its demands were not met.

Miki's husband Zenbei finally acceded to the kami's wishes on the morning of the twenty-sixth of the tenth month. Tenrikyō regards this day as the date of its foundation and celebrates it every October 26 as the Autumn Grand Service (*shūki taisai*). To Tenrikyō faithful, this grand service commemorates the date when Miki became 'the Living Shrine of God the Parent,' or the corporeal vehicle for the revelations of the Tenri kami. To put it clearly from a Tenrikyō perspective, from this day onward, Miki's life, actions, and words are considered to come directly from the intention of God the Parent "to save all humankind" (D 3).

From this time on, Miki, who was a model housewife until her kamigakari, began to neglect her children and her duties, secluding herself in the family storehouse to have conversations with the kami. Miki was then ordered to enter 'the depths of poverty,' dispensing the wealth of the Nakayama family through acts of charity to initiate the 'path of universal salvation.' Miki's excessive charity resulted in her being derided as a fox or badger (*tanuki*) spirit and as a kami of poverty. Many others dismissed her as insane.

Miki initiated the Grant of Safe Childbirth in 1854 (*obiya-yurushi*) for the sake of expectant mothers. She subsequently offered magico-religious cures for a variety of illnesses and her reputation as a living kami spread throughout the countryside of Yamato, which gradually allowed her to attract a devoted following.

Miki and her nascent movement suffered from persecution in the early Meiji period since her charismatic role as a 'living kami' proved to be incompatible with the policy of 'civilization and enlightenment' (*bunmei kaika*)

adopted by the Meiji government to encourage Japan's transformation into a modern nation-state. As a result, Miki openly challenged local Shintō priests over the legitimacy of the new Meiji government during the height of the Great Promulgation Campaign (*taikyō senpu undō*) disseminated through the Teaching Academies (*kyō-in*). In the scripture the *Ofudesaki*, Miki criticized the 'high mountains' (authorities) for obstructing her efforts and those of her followers from accomplishing the eschatological vision of her 'kami' (also identified in the *Ofudesaki* as 'Tsuki-Hi,' Moon-Sun, and 'Oya,' Parent). Miki also promulgated an innovative cosmogony—variously known as *Moto hajimari no hanashi* (the story of the beginnings of origin) or *Doroumi Kōki* (the chronicles of the muddy waters)—that sharply stood in contrast from the accepted canon of State Shintō.

In her cosmogony Miki maintained that the Nakayama household was the place (*Jiba*) where her kami Tsuki-Hi created the world and humankind through a mystical process involving creatures in a muddy ocean. Also according to this cosmogony, Tsuki-Hi created the world with the goal of having human beings live a life of joyousness (*yōki yusan* or *yōki-zukume*), more widely known today as *yōkigurashi* (the Joyous Life). Tenrikyō cosmogony relates that the founding of the faith is directly related to the promise Tsuki-Hi made at creation to the parental kami Izanami (or *iza iza no nai mi* いざいざの無巳, 'snake without scales') and Izanagi (or *iza iza no nai gigyo* いざいざの無岐魚, 'fish without scales') to bring them back to the original place of creation where they could be "adored by their posterity" (D 20; DK; Kontani 33). Lastly, the *Doroumi Kōki* explained the significance of the Kagura section of the Service (*Kagura Zutome*)—the central soteriological rite of Tenrikyō—and the ten kami (*tohashira no kami* 十柱の神) that were represented by the ten dancers of the ritual.

Together, the *Ofudesaki* and *Doroumi Kōki* provided an eschatological cosmology which prophesized that the heavenly dew (*kanro*) would fall upon the Jiba when the hearts of humankind had been sufficiently purified in accordance to Tsuki-Hi's divine vision through the performance of the Tenrikyō Service (*Tsutome*). Miki had left instructions in the *Ofudesaki* on how to build the Kanrodai (Stand of Heavenly Dew), the physical marker of the Jiba. It was believed that when the heavenly dew was mixed with barley flour in a vessel placed atop the Kanrodai, it would create a magical food that gave people the ability to live to the age of one-hundred fifteen years and beyond (MKZ 21: 140-146).

During her lifetime Miki spontaneously transmitted her charismatic abilities to a select number of her followers through *Sazuke*, or grants. Most of these *Sazuke* granted a follower the ability to petition for the kami's intervention to heal illness. However, Iburi Izō 飯降伊蔵 (1833-1907) was one of two followers who received a grant called *gonjō no ukagai* or *yurushi* 言上のうかがい・言上の許し (the Invocation or Grant of Speech) which allowed him to orally invoke the will of the kami.<sup>7</sup> In the years preceding her death, Miki sent to Izō followers who sought advice relating to everyday mundane concerns while she concentrated on instructing in religious matters, most notably the *Doroumi Kōki* cosmogony. There was also a group of leading followers known as *toritsugi* (intermediaries) who instructed beginners in the basics of Miki's teachings. When Miki died in 1887, because newer converts were already accustomed to receiving instruction

---

<sup>7</sup> The *Tenrikyō jiten* mentions a woman by the name of Inui Fusa who also received this grant from Miki sometime in the year 1864 (TJ 361). However, another source claims she was strongly discouraged by her family members from participating in Tenrikyō after the death of her son Kanbei in 1877 (TJKH 561).



from others, her passing was not as traumatic to them as it was for elder followers.

Nevertheless, Miki's death was unexpected as it was widely believed by her adherents that she would be able to live to be a hundred and fifteen years old, the "natural term of life" recorded in the *Ofudesaki* (Of III: 100). To account for why Miki failed to live to this age and 'withdrew her physical being' at age ninety,<sup>8</sup> Izō explained that she "cut short the twenty-five years of life that was to be" so that her followers could openly conduct the Tenrikyō Service without worrying over the possibility of the police coming to arrest her (LO 241). Izō also announced that Miki in the meantime would continue to lead the movement without a physical body, which established the fundamental Tenrikyō doctrine of the 'everliving' Foundress (*go-zonmei no Oyasama*). Izō promised the members he would continue to bestow the Sazuke in her place and that they could continue to communicate with Miki through his mediation.

Miki's 'withdrawal from physical life' is an event in history that defines the Tenrikyō community in a manner that is comparable to Jesus' crucifixion for Christians and the Exodus for Judaism. The Spring Grand Service (*shunki taisai*) is conducted with full ceremony each year and scheduled to begin so that it ends at two p.m., when the daily siren in Tenri City sounds to commemorate Miki's 'withdrawal.' Every ten years, an 'anniversary of Oyasama' (*nensai*) is celebrated. For more than a hundred years, Tenrikyō followers "joined their sincere efforts and did everything in their power to prepare for the anniversaries of Oyasama, which they saw as marking crucial stages in their quest for spiritual growth" (Nakayama Zenji 2002, 5).

---

<sup>8</sup> This paper will follow the traditional manner of counting a person's age in Japan. A person is considered a year old at birth and ages accordingly with the arrival of each New Year.

Although Iburi Izō acted as Miki's corporeal representative, there was another individual who was viewed as a legitimate successor of her charismatic authority. While Izō, who came to be known as the '*Honseki*' 本席 or 'main seat,' was primarily seen as Miki's proxy concerning spiritual matters in her physical absence, Miki had designated her grandson Nakayama Shinnosuke 中山眞之亮 (1866-1914) to occupy a position she had named '*Shinbashira*' 真柱 (literally, 'central pillar') to be the group's temporal representative. As a certified doctrinal instructor (*kyōdōshoku* 教導職), Shinnosuke was recognized as the administrative head (*kaichō*, later *kanchō* 管長) of Tenrikyō, a subsect of the Shintō Honkyoku since 1886.<sup>9</sup> While some observers have claimed Shinnosuke initially refused to accept Izō's role as the designated spiritual mediator between the believers and the kami (Oguri 186-187), the roles of the two individuals came to compliment one another.

Izō's revelations were recorded and eventually compiled into the scripture named the *Osashizu*, i.e., the (divine) directions.<sup>10</sup> The *Osashizu* as a scripture is generally divided into two general categories—'timely talks' (*kokugen no sashizu* 刻限のさしづ) and inquiries (*ukagai no sashizu* 伺いのさしづ). While Izō's most urgent revelations, the 'timely talks,' were delivered spontaneously without warning, his speech and behavior revealed a routinized pattern when

<sup>9</sup> Tenrikyō received sanction as a sixth rank church (*buzoku roku-tō kyōkai*) under the Shintō Honkyoku in 1886 but failed to receive prefectural sanction to officially establish its headquarters until 1888. The Tenrikyō organization was promoted to the third rank in 1889 and the first rank in 1891 (Murakami 1974, 46). It should also be noted that the position of the Shinbashira was formally known as *kanchō* until the end of World War II (Aochi 1970, 225-226; 250). Nevertheless, Nakayama Shinnosuke was regularly referred to by Izō as the 'Shinbashira' and is presently regarded by the Tenrikyō faithful as the first holder of the office.

<sup>10</sup> Though there are a few passages from the *Osashizu* in 1887 that are written record of Miki's words, the vast majority of these passages are attributed to Izō. The *Osashizu* contains twenty years worth of Izō's inspired sayings between January 4, 1887 to June 9, 1907.

Shinnosuke or other followers approached him to inquire the divine will. Followers inquired the Honseki about personal affairs such as illness and he offered spiritual guidance in response. It was also Izō's role to authorize administrative decisions concerning rituals and promotions in an inspired state. Under the united leadership represented by the prophet Izō and Shinnosuke as the administrative head, Tenrikyō grew from a loosely connected network of religious confraternities (*kō* 講) into a vast pyramidal ecclesiastical hierarchy of branch churches within ten years of Miki's death.<sup>11</sup>

Missionaries who founded the first Tenrikyō branch churches in late 1888 and in 1889 cured a variety of illnesses with Sazuke prayers, leading to an exponential growth in membership. While there was a potential danger for elder charismatic missionaries to split and create movements of their own, Izō revealed that the Sazuke was ultimately a gift from Miki and thus maintained their loyalty to the organization. Miraculous cures and the rapid increase of converts were all attributed to the divine power of the 'everliving' Miki.

Between 1891 and 1896, the number of Tenrikyō churches increased from thirty-two to 1,292 and were spread throughout every prefecture in Japan with the exception of Okinawa (Ōya 30-31, n. 30). In the year 1896 the institution collected membership fees from 3,137,113, or roughly eight percent of Japan's population (Arakitōryō Henshūbu 2002, 38). The Home Ministry (Naimushō

---

<sup>11</sup> Like other new religions of Bakumatsu-early Meiji periods, Tenrikyō originally organized themselves into *kō*, which have been variously translated as "religious associations," "lay believers' associations" or "confraternities." *Kō* were the dominant form of lay organization extant since at least the 15th century. Duncan Williams has pointed out that there were *kō* of at least three major types that organized themselves around the worship of particular deities, style of religious practices, or pilgrimage sites (84). *Kō* were also variously organized according to members' occupation, gender, and age. According to Tenrikyō documents, Miki had encouraged her followers to form *kō* as early as 1863 (KTK 142). "Unlike the *hōon-kō* 報恩講 of Jōdo Shinshū or the *miyaza* 宮座 of local shrines, Tenrikyō's *kō* were rarely involved in the administration of community matters and, more often than not, they were excluded from the local community" (Hatakama 2002, 90).

内務省) responded to Tenrikyō's explosive growth by issuing a directive in the same year to force a revision of its doctrine and ritual procedures. Izō authorized a number of compromises to Miki's teachings over the next several years as Tenrikyō petitioned repeatedly to attain its independence from the Shintō Honkyoku. Following the creation of a canonical document (the so-called Meiji Kyōten) that fully aligned its official theology with the ideology of State Shintō, Tenrikyō was finally recognized as the last legal Kyōha Shintō organization in 1908.

While Izō initially continued to bestow Sazuke grants in a spontaneous manner in Miki's place, an increased demand for this grant from followers who desired to become missionaries eventually led to the creation of a standardized lecture system known as the Besseki between 1889 and 1890. Members who wished to receive the Sazuke were required to complete nine lectures (the Besseki 別席, literally, 'special' or 'separate seat') that covered Miki's teachings and detailed her exemplary life.<sup>12</sup> In this way the Besseki system was a routinized procedure where hagiographic depictions of her life became a part of the shared experience of the Tenrikyō membership before members received the ability to channel Miki's 'everliving' divine power. Further, though Miki and Izō bestowed different forms of Sazuke, eventually the manner in which the Sazuke was applied also became standardized.<sup>13</sup> As the charismatic office of the

---

<sup>12</sup> It usually takes no less than nine months to complete the Besseki lectures as it was a guideline for one to take no more than one lecture each month. However, exceptions were granted to followers who lived more than two hundred kilometers beyond Jiba, or the Tenrikyō headquarters. The further a follower lived away from Jiba, theoretically the more lectures they were allowed to attend within a month's time. For current regulations concerning the Besseki lectures refer to Tenrikyō Dōyūsha (2002, 135).

<sup>13</sup> That is, the Sazuke was standardized into the form as it exists today. A missionary chants "*Ashiki harai tasuke tamae, Tenri-Ō-no-Mikoto*" three times with accompanying hand movements and chants "*Namu tasuke tamae Tenri-Ō-no-Mikoto*" three times while stroking the afflicted area of an ill person. This process is repeated another two times to complete the ritual. In Miki's time this form of the Sazuke was called the *Teodori no sazukey* or Sazuke of the Hand Dance. While a

Honseki disappeared following Izō's death, the task of transmitting the Sazuke to Tenrikyō adherents was ultimately handed over to the Shinbashira. To date, the office of Shinbashira has continued to be passed down in hereditary manner to a descendant of Nakayama Miki.

### **Basic methodological considerations**

Whether applying a substantive, functional, or semiotic definition of religion, it can be said with great confidence that Tenrikyō would fit the criteria to be called a 'religion' in each case.<sup>14</sup> Tenrikyō clearly has its own unique soteriological and cosmological system, which is elaborated through a variety of symbols and metaphors. However, it would be highly irresponsible and presumptive to end the discussion at this point. A major underlying assumption in this work is that 'religions' will be treated as social entities that are subject to socio-historical processes; that the formation, perpetuation, and revitalization of religions are carried out by devoted participants.

In the same way, schism will also be essentially viewed as a sociological phenomenon. This study will adopt the definition of schism as

the process by which a religious body divides to become two or more distinct, independent bodies. The division takes place because one or each of the bodies has come to see the other as deviant, as too different to be recognized as part of the same religious brotherhood (Ammerman 99).

---

description of the other forms of Sazuke that were once bestowed in the past will be covered briefly in chapters one and two, refer to Masui (1994, 1: 125-213), Morishita (134-136), and Nakayama Shōzen (1986, 13-16) for further information.

<sup>14</sup> Refer to Fitzgerald and Langmuir (69-130) on discussions on the limitations of several well-known definitions of religion proposed by a variety of scholars.

However, by implication, schism also includes an ideological aspect often veiled in a discourse in which the accusation of heresy is pronounced by the parent body, the dissenting body, or both. Such charges of heresy or intolerable deviancy usually depend on a source of authority (whether it be a single leader, group of leaders, or a canonical document) which is a hallmark of 'confessional religions,' a religion that can trace itself to an individual founder (Rudolph 271-272). Tenrikyō, by most scholarly standards, would qualify to be called a 'confessional religion.' A source of absolute authority in Tenrikyō would ultimately come from the writings and sayings of founder Nakayama Miki and her designated heir Iburi Izō. A doctrinal position that has no explicit reference in scripture would rest on the interpretation established by Tenrikyo Church Headquarters (*Tenrikyō Kyōkai Honbu*) in Tenri City, the institution that inherited Miki's charismatic authority. At present, the final authority on doctrinal and ritual matters within the institution is placed in the hands of the individual who holds the hereditary office known as the Shinbashira.

The discourse of 'orthodoxy' and 'heresy' often falls under the conceptual framework of 'correct' or 'incorrect' belief or practice and implies the existence of such a central authority to distinguish between them. Further, the terms represent an insider perspective. To elaborate:

'Orthodox' and 'heterodox' are value judgments only when used by adherents of a religion considered orthodox. In themselves the terms express nothing more than the presence of agreement or disagreement with a teaching considered binding for a particular group (Dexinger 112).

This being the case, 'orthodoxy' and 'heresy' or 'heterodoxy' can prove to be difficult to define as such insider conceptualizations are relative to time and

space (Russell 276). In the initial developmental stages of a religious movement, concepts of 'orthodoxy' and 'heresy' are more often than not amorphous, especially when a central authority has not been established. Histories of other religions reveal that such a phenomenon is not uncommon as the development of the concept of heresy and accompanying nomenclature is often an extended, involved process. In Christianity, Paul used the Greek *haireseis* in its original meaning to signify 'opinions' and the term did not have the connotations of rejected doctrine until the second century (*ibid.*). Also, although the concepts of orthodoxy and heresy was a central issue throughout the institutionalization process of Jōdo Shinshū, it was not until 1800 when '*ianjin*' (aberrant faith) became the standard expression referring to an unacceptable deviancy from faith (Dobbins 2002, 8-9). Though my research on the development of the discourse of heresy in Tenrikyō is still at a preliminary stage, it appears that the most common terms used to mean 'heresy'—'*itan*' 異端 and '*isetsu*' 異説—have come into regular usage only in the last twenty to thirty years. According to the *Dai kanwa jiten*, the *locus classicus* of the term '*itan*' comes from the Analects 2:16 and refers to 'a path that is contrary to that of a sage' and 'a path that is not orthodox' (Morohashi 7: 21866-188). '*Isetsu*' is rendered as 'a questionable view' and 'an opinion without consensus' (*ibid.* 21866-165).

Another of my main assumptions in this paper holds that the development of insider categories of 'orthodoxy' and 'heresy' is an ongoing process of normative self-definition for a religious movement. The sociological phenomenon of schism presents a stage where these ideological categories are set in motion and reflects a process of elimination that helps maintain consensus within a religious organization. One of the functions of having an established orthodoxy is that it provides an institution with protection against illegitimate

claims of authority. As Tenrikyō developed into a complex institutional body, a significant number of the clergy came to be responsible for transmitting and interpreting the orthodox positions that have been established by the tradition. Thus in this paper, orthodoxy will be considered as “Those elements of religiosity that are explicitly prescribed by people exercising authority over other people” (Langmuir 136).<sup>15</sup> In turn, ‘heresy’ will represent an insider designation of an intolerable deviancy from the self-defined tenets presently maintained by the Tenrikyō institution. More specifically, ‘heresy’ shall also represent the English equivalent of the current Tenrikyō terms that signify an unaccepted deviation from orthodoxy: *‘itan’* and *‘isetsu’*. It must be mentioned that in established religious institutions such as Roman Catholicism, not every schism is necessarily considered a heresy nor does every heresy necessarily lead to schism. However, because the three schisms from Tenrikyō to be discussed in this work are also considered as heresies by the Tenrikyō institution, I shall consider heresy as the ideological aspect of the sociological phenomenon of schism.

### **The ‘raw materials’ of schism:**

#### **Social tension, organizational conditions, and state regulation**

While Rodney Stark has been criticized by his peers for utilizing the terms ‘success’ and ‘failure’ in describing the fortunes of various religions (see Johnson 252), I will nevertheless borrow from his theoretical model that attempts to delineate the factors involved in a religion’s degree of vitality. In particular, I find the conditions of ‘a medium level of tension with the surrounding environment’ and ‘legitimate authority’ especially useful in conceptualizing the

---

<sup>15</sup> This is Langmuir’s definition of ‘religion.’ He sums up religiosity as nonrational and ‘ultra-empirical’ forms of thought that are nevertheless empirically verifiable in the actions and expressions of individuals. See Langmuir (143-176).



phenomenon of religious schism. In this way I hope to identify the 'raw materials' that are involved in the process of schism.

To elaborate, in describing the conditions that allow schism to occur, Nancy Ammerman writes:

"[S]chism also occurs in a social context in which economic divisions and changes, the process of modernization, and political differences impinge on the way people organize themselves into religious bodies. Those structural conditions provide the background and raw materials of schism, and specific organizational conditions provide the means by which a separation is finally accomplished (Ammerman 102).

While Ammerman introduces this concept in the context of organizational conditions that encourage cleavage and fragmentation, I hope to also include the role of environmental factors such as social tension, 'legitimate authority,' and charisma and its routinization as the 'raw materials' that lead to schism.

Rodney Stark and William Sims Bainbridge have postulated the theory that schism is fostered by the level of tension or deviancy a religion has with its social environment. The authors, taking cues from the contributions of sociologist H. Richard Niebuhr, insist that as socialized members (or those born within the faith) replace recent converts within the religious leadership, the religion tends to move toward a degree of accommodation with the larger society. They maintain that as a religion grows into a mainstream organization, the religious leadership will take steps toward reducing its tension with its social environment in order to reap the 'rewards' society offers, such as elevated economic or political status. When a degree of class stratification develops, the risk for the religious movement to splinter along these emerging social divisions increases. "To the degree that members differ in power and privilege, they will

tend to form subnetworks, each having distinctive and conflicting religious needs. The more powerful will want to reduce tension; the less powerful will want to raise it or keep it high" (Stark and Bainbridge 1985, 107).

In other words, Stark and Bainbridge have proposed that disenfranchised members tend to favor a higher-tension relationship, since they essentially have little to lose by increasing the amount of tension with society (1987, 143). The two authors further argue that an active endeavor undertaken by the religious leadership to reduce tension or to use their words, "to make peace with the world," potentially delegitimizes the organization and undermines the basis of commitment to that organization (Stark and Bainbridge 1985, 138). It can be said that their concept of social tension as a source of religious dissent and schism is essentially a reformulation of deprivation theory. Despite the methodological dilemmas of attributing the sociological appeal of joining new religious movements to 'deprivation,' relative or otherwise, a number of recent studies on topics disparate as Ōbaku Zen in the Tokugawa period and evangelical movements in the modern United Methodist Church illustrate how a moderate degree of tension with society is able to encourage cohesiveness within a religious movement (Baroni 2000; Finke and Stark 181-187). Such studies have contributed to the sociological theory that accommodation and a reduction of social tension on the part of a religious organization often facilitates a loss of distinctiveness with other groups, which in turn potentially undermines the commitment of its members to the religious institution. These adherents may then turn their attention to nascent schismatic movements that they consider to be more suited to fulfill their religious needs.

Regarding organizational concerns, as stated above, the foundations of Tenrikyō's ecclesiastical structure has its roots in kō organizations that were

mainly based on a community of followers from particular villages. Following their recognition as a subset of the Shintō Honkyoku in 1886 and establishing their Church Headquarters in 1888, Tenrikyō reorganized existing *kō* into a hierarchy of branch churches.<sup>16</sup> As active propagation in the name of Tenrikyō was seen as an ideal expression of devotion and gratitude to the kami, members of existing branch churches who had attracted a following of their own were encouraged to establish sub-branch churches. This soon led to the formation of what has been described as a 'tree-structure' church hierarchy where patterns of conversion existing between members were institutionalized along generational lineages of branch churches that led to the headquarters, which functioned as the trunk or root (see Inoue N. 2002, 415). In other words, sub-branch churches would continue to be supervised by the very branch churches to which their founding ministers belonged. Successful sub-branches would in turn have a number of their own branch churches or missions. Arai Ken has called this type of ecclesiastical structure a parent-child model of organization.

---

<sup>16</sup> From 1888 to 1908, Tenrikyō had the following hierarchical system of branch churches (from largest to smallest): *bunkiyōkai* 分教会, *shikiyōkai* 支教会, *shucchōsho* 出張所, and *fukuyō-jimu toriatsukaisho* 布教事務取扱所 (shortened to *fukuyōsho* in 1895) (TJ 257). In 1893, the criteria for a place of worship to be a *bunkiyōkai* was a minimum of 2000 member households; the minimum for a *shikiyōkai* was 600; a *shucchōsho* 300; and a *fukuyōsho* 150. Another type of social unit, called a *shūdansho* 集談所, while not formally registered with Tenrikyō headquarters or prefectural authorities, were significant in that these only required authorization from law enforcement officials to allow followers to gather for sermons and to practice rituals (*ibid.* 412-413).

Following Tenrikyō's attainment of sectarian independence in 1908, the organizational system was restructured through the introduction of new criteria and nomenclature: a church with a minimum of ten thousand member households was known as a *daikiyōkai* 大教会; a *kyōkai* had a minimum of 5000 member households; a *bunkiyōkai* 2000; a *shikiyōkai* 500; and a *senkyōsho* 宣教所 100 (*ibid.* 503). A variation of this system existed until 1941. Presently, the ecclesiastical organization has been simplified into a system of *daikiyōkai*, *bunkiyōkai*, and *fukuyōsho*. While there are a few exceptions, a *daikiyōkai* is required to fulfill the minimum of fifty or more branches and are directly supervised by Tenrikyō headquarters. A *bunkiyōkai* (called *kyōkai* in the case an overseas church) is required at its founding to have over fifteen member *yōboku*, or recipients of the Sazuke of whom five must be graduates of the first half of the Head Minister Qualification Course (who are otherwise known as *kyōto* 教人). The only criteria for the establishment of a *fukuyōsho* is that its head minister be a *yōboku*.

The model on which nearly all the new religions rely as their basic principle of organization is that of the parent-child relation as it has evolved in Japan. The person under whose guidance one is led to join a new religion takes the position of a parent, and the person so led assumes the subordinate role of a child. Thus the process whereby new members are drawn into the group automatically locates all members in a vertical network of quasi-familial relations" (Arai 100-101).

Arai points out the weakness of such a vertical network, which

comes into view when internal discord arises. Since more importance attaches to the relations between spiritual parents and children than to their common relation to a body of doctrine, when dissension occurs, it may easily become critical. If one who is himself a spiritual parent to many "children" has a dispute with the leader, he may well summon his followers and form an independent group (Arai 101).

Arai further explains that the parent-child model of organization was a significant factor behind the emergence of numerous direct schisms that broke away from Reiyūkai. On the other hand, Tenrikyō has been relatively stable considering the number of charismatic founders (*shodai kaichō*) of current grand churches. These include former *yakuza* leader Hirano Narazō; Fukaya Genjirō, known as '*nikoniko Gen-san*' or cheerful Gen; and sailor Tosa Unosuke; all of whom have been the subject of movies and children's books. While Tenrikyō has been relatively successful in avoiding major schisms and maintaining loyalties to the parent body, most of the organizational breaks have occurred in the manner Arai has described—a particular branch breaks away to follow its leader that begins to claim to a higher authority than that of headquarters. It must be noted however, that Honmichi, the schism presently with the largest membership was able to appeal to adherents in the Tenrikyō organization as a whole and drew its followers from a number of different branches. The possible explanation for this

development may come from the fact that by that time, a horizontal diocese network was developed in conjunction with Tenrikyō's independence movement from the Shintō Honkyoku.

Lastly, it is worthy to mention that Tenrikyō's accommodation to social tension and the development of its organizational structure was initiated under the scrutinizing pressure of the state. In fact, state regulation of religious institutions has been a consistent theme throughout Japan's history until the end of World War II. Secular authorities fully recognized the ability of religious commitment to undermine and compete with its authority. It can be declared with confidence that a history of Tenrikyō would be incomplete without discussion of the prevalence of state control over the religious market in the Meiji and early Shōwa periods. The state was highly involved in strictly regulating the Tenrikyō institution in 1896 with the Secret Directives and over the entire religious market as a whole in the late 1920s and throughout the Pacific War years.

#### **The issue of legitimate authority:**

##### **Charisma and the implications surrounding its routinization**

Max Weber has proposed that there are three "pure" forms of "legitimate authority" which social organizations can claim: (1) rational or legal; (2) traditional; and (3) charismatic (1968, 46). Of these three types, Weber considers charismatic authority as the most appropriate type of authority involved at the initiation stage of a religious movement. The basis of this religious authority is often described as 'charisma,' or

a certain quality of an individual personality by virtue [s/he] is considered extraordinary and treated as endowed with supernatural, superhuman, or at least specifically exceptional powers or qualities. These are such as are not accessible to the ordinary person, but are regarded as of divine origins or as exemplary, and on the basis of them the individual concerned is treated as a "leader" (Weber 1947, 358; 1978, 241-242).

It can be stated with a high degree of certainty that Miki would fit into Weber's definition of a charismatic individual. To be specific, 'charisma' is a function of recognition, and as a living kami with powers that guaranteed safe childbirth and healing of disease in a social environment where the populace highly valued efficacious sources of this-worldly benefits (*genze riyaku* 現世利益), Miki was widely regarded as a legitimate religious figure.

While Weber offered the proposal of charisma as a necessary ingredient in the emergence of religions, he also regarded charisma, in its 'purest' form, to be inherently unstable in the sense it is both anti-economic and irrational. In Miki's case, her excessive charity that resulted from her kamigakari was not only anti-economic to the extreme but was considered highly irrational in that many around her doubted her sanity. Even when she began her religious career, she rarely demanded any compensation in exchange for her services beyond a person's sincere appreciation (IH 5-7). Further, 'pure' charisma is also destabilizing in that it constantly needs to be 'proven' and must successfully elude or at least attain a degree of immunity to empirical disconfirmation. Second, charisma has a tendency of undermining the development of a status quo with its antiestablishment and revolutionary qualities. Lastly, charisma is a source of potential innovation and the issue of ongoing revelation also undermines the ability of the leadership to oversee the shaping of an accepted orthodoxy (Roberts 174). In order for a religious organization to be able to

sustain itself, charisma must be transformed or 'routinized' into a legal or traditional basis of authority.

Within the context of traditional shamanistic rites, the phenomenon of kamigakari served to reinforce an already existing value-system. Yet for Miki and other founders of new religions, kamigakari became "a source of transformative knowledge" from which each began to elaborate their own versions of a cosmology and soteriology absent from Shugendō and other shamanistic traditions (Groszos-Ooms 9-19). In this way, "the initial adoption of a traditional shamanistic role was only the first phase of a founder's career as a religious practitioner" (*ibid.* 12). And because kamigakari was "theoretically open to anyone" who displayed its characteristics, the new religions each explicitly closed and limited the kamigakari experience to the founder and their designated heirs. The *Ofudesaki* contains a rhetoric that reminds the reader of the divine origins of Miki's written and spoken word. At this point the function of kamigakari in Tenrikyō overlaps with that of revelation (*tenkei* 天啓) in that of a confessional religion and becomes the foundation of an authoritative canon.

One of the most important issues that needs to be resolved during the routinization (or institutionalization) process is the issue of succession. In Tenrikyō's case, the succession issue appears to be fairly clear-cut. In Tenrikyō histories, Iburi Izō is portrayed as the corporeal vehicle of Nakayama Miki after her 'withdrawal from physical life,' and helped guide the administrative leadership until the institution was able to stand on its own strength. Revelation was considered by the Tenrikyō leadership to have ended with Izō's death, whereupon heirs to the Nakayama family—beginning with Shinnosuke and subsequently succeeded by Shōzen 正善 (1905-1967), Zenye 善衛 (1932- ), and

most recently Zenji 善司 (1959- )— have held and still continue to hold the title of Shinbashira. The current process of selecting the Shinbashira described in *The Constitution of Tenrikyo* (*Tenrikyō kyōki*) reflects a hereditary-legal solution to the issue of succession.<sup>17</sup> The succession of Nakayama heirs to the office of Shinbashira reveals a strict pattern of lineal transmission that conforms to the preferred form of inheritance throughout Japanese history (Mass 4-5). However, as we will see in chapter three, the issue of succession was not as clear-cut as Tenrikyō's official histories would like to present. Evidence reveals there existed an undercurrent of adherents within the Tenrikyō organization who refused to accept the office of the Shinbashira as legitimate and instead favored a religious group that was led by another charismatic leader who claimed to be the successor of Nakayama Miki and Iburi Izō.

Presently the tradition attempts to emphasize the uniqueness of Miki's experience by maintaining that the founding of Tenrikyō represents the convergence of the Three Causalities, or Preordinations (*san innen*). The first of these is "the Causality of the Residence" (*yashiki no innen*) which points to the place, called the Jiba, where the original conception of humankind occurred. The second is "the Causality of the Promised Time" (*shun kokugen no innen* or *ri*). This refers to the promise God the Parent made to Izanami and the Izanagi that "God would take them back to the Jiba, the place of the origin... when the years equal to the number of their first-born had lapsed" (TOMD 1979, 38). The date of the founding of Tenrikyō is a marker of mythological time, the passage of nine hundred million, ninety-nine thousand, nine hundred and ninety nine years

---

<sup>17</sup> "The Shinbashira shall bear the family name of Nakayama. The successor to the Shinbashira shall be designated, based on the lineage of Oyasama [i.e., Nakayama Miki] at a meeting of Honbu-in (Church Headquarters executive staff members). The lineage record shall be preserved by the Director-in-Chief of Religious Affairs (*uchitōryō*)" (TOD 2003, 2).



since first childbirth of Izanami. Last, is “the Causality of the Soul of the Foundress” (*Oyasama tamashi no innen*). Simply stated, the reason why Nakayama Miki was chosen as the Shrine of Tsuki-Hi (God the Parent) was that her soul is that of Izanami to whom God promised to return “back to the Jiba, the place of the origin, to be adored by their posterity when the years equal to the number of their first-born had lapsed” (*ibid.*). Thus in Tenrikyō the spot where Miki experienced her initial kamigakari was routinized as the place of creation in the tradition’s cosmogony.<sup>18</sup>

### The centrality of sacred space in Tenrikyō orthodoxy

In Tenrikyō scripture, the Jiba is considered to be ‘the origin of this world’ (*yo no moto*, MKU III: 1 and V: 9); ‘the true origin of the world’ (*yo no honmoto*, Of VIII: 25); ‘the Residence’ and the ‘very place’ where human beings were created as described in the Tenrikyō cosmogony (Of IV: 55 and VIII: 36). The *Ofudesaki* also describes in detail where the Jiba can be found and makes the claim that members of the Nakayama family were involved in the creation of the world. (“The very beginning of this world was at Shoyashiki Village of Yamabe County in Yamato Province. There, at the place known as the Nakayama Residence, appear instruments of human beginnings,” Of XI: 69-70).

A variety of appellations are used within the scriptures to refer to the Jiba. The appellations include ‘*koko*’ (MKU IV: 9 and V: 9; Of XI: 67), ‘this place’ (*kono tokoro*, MKU V: 2 and V: 7), the ‘original home’ (*komoto*, MKU IX: 10, XII: 4), and ‘the Residence’ (*yashiki*, MKU VII: 8 and XI: 8). Another appellation is ‘Tsutome

---

<sup>18</sup> According to Chapter I, Article 1, of *The Constitution of Tenrikyo*: “Tenrikyo, revealed through Miki Nakayama who is revered as the Shrine of Tsuki-Hi, had its beginning on the 26th of October in 1838 at the Jiba of Origin” (TOD 2003, 1; emphasis mine).

(no) basho' (MKU III: 1 and 2; Of VIII: 36), referring to the physical building that was completed by Iburi Izō in 1865 that was constructed near the Jiba as a worship hall.

The Jiba is presented as a 'remarkable place' (*mezurashi tokoro*, MKU V: 9) and a 'paradise on this earth' (*kono yo no gokuraku ya*, MKU IV: 9). It is 'the original home' where the faithful are encouraged to visit on pilgrimage (MKU IX: 10) and bring 'good masters' (*tōryō*, i.e., potential missionaries, MKU XII: 4). Finally, it is the place designated as the 'abode of God' (*kami no yakata no jiba*, MKU XI: 1); where the faithful accumulate good deeds (MKU VII: 8 and Song Eleven as a whole) and the source of divine salvation and grants of safe childbirth and cure from smallpox (MKU V: 2 and 7).

Tenrikyō is unique among religions in its claim that the Jiba, around which its headquarters were built, is the historical birthplace of humankind. Scholars have been quick to notice the centrality of the Jiba in Tenrikyō, that it is a "pilgrimage faith" (Ellwood 1982), and that it is closely related to the movement's institutionalization (Wagner). A pilgrimage to Tenrikyō headquarters is called an *ojibagaeri*, a 'return home to Jiba,' regardless whether it happens be the pilgrim's first visit. '*Okaerinasai*' (welcome home) is a common greeting addressed to returning pilgrims by adherents. It is also the place where the name of God the Parent, Tenri-Ō-no-Mikoto, has been bestowed (D 34). While there is a willingness by Tenrikyō clergy to accept the descriptions of the Tenrikyō cosmogony as a metaphorical story explaining the providence of the Tenri kami, the reluctance to adopt the notion that the Jiba is a spiritual rather than the actual historical site of human creation has been noted (Becker 1986, 499).

Given the importance of the Jiba in Tenrikyō orthodoxy, it may be not too much of a surprise that Tenrikyō perceives the schisms to be discussed in this study as challenges to the authority of sacred person and space. For this reason the founders and adherents of each of these schisms were resoundingly expelled from the Tenrikyō community. As forms of religious expression that challenged an established religious authority in the movement, each schism explicitly played a significant role toward establishing a component of Tenrikyō's self-defined orthodoxy. Through effectively dealing with the theological claims that either implicitly undermined the authority of Nakayama Miki or the institution that eventually inherited her authority, Tenrikyō authorities maintained consensus within the organization. Finally, each of the three case studies illustrate in their own way the manner charisma, or more specifically kamigakari, sanctifies new knowledge and doctrinal innovation that operates beyond the reach of institutional authority.

### Organization of chapters

Chapter one will cover a heresy from 1865 known within Tenrikyō as the 'Sukezō jiken' (incident) that occurred during Nakayama Miki's lifetime. A follower by the name of Imai Sukezō 今井助藏 (1831-1891) initiated the incident. The 'Sukezō jiken' is noteworthy since it marks the first schism emerging from Miki's nascent religion, before any formal expression of doctrine through scriptures or the development of ritual (*Tsutome*). It remains a defining moment in the history of Tenrikyō, and is prominently depicted in the official hagiography of Nakayama Miki. The Sukezō jiken is an intriguing episode

showing how Miki dealt with what was to her an unacceptable deviation of her self-defined teachings in her lifetime.

The incident also was a microcosm of the larger sociological context of the late Tokugawa period, when the emergence of the new religions posed an economic threat to Shugendō groups. The Sukezō jiken also reflected the tension that existed between Miki's movement and religions that enjoyed official recognition. The incident was also closely related to the territorial rivalry between Yoshida Shintō and Tōzan-ha Shugendō in Yamato Province.

Chapter two presents a schism that occurred in 1897, initiated by Iida Iwajirō 飯田岩治郎 (1858-1907), founder of Daidōkyō. Iwajirō's heresy—which is known as the 'Ando jiken' (after the name of his village) or 'Mizu-yashiki jiken' ('the Residence of Water incident')—occurred under the watch of Miki's immediate spiritual successor, Iburi Izō, shortly after the Meiji government drafted the Secret Directives in order to impose strict control over Tenrikyō. Iwajirō was the head minister of Tenrikyō Heian Shikyōkai who had also received a charismatic transmission from Miki that allowed him to offer the Sazuke of Water. According to Tenrikyō's current account of the incident, Iwajirō claimed that Ando Village was the Residence of Water (because he offered the Sazuke of Water) while the Jiba was the Residence of Fire (*hi no moto Shōyashiki*). These same accounts portray that Iwajirō claimed supremacy of his Residence based on the argument that water puts out fire. The divine messages Izō conveyed concerning this incident gradually became more severe over time, and eventually Iwajirō was removed from his position of head minister.

Chapter three will cover the emergence of the Tenri Kenkyūkai in the early Shōwa period. In 1913 Tenrikyō missionary Ōnishi Aijirō 大西愛治郎 (1881-

1958) underwent a transcendental religious experience and subsequently claimed to be the recipient of a new revelation; his movement would eventually create the religion today known as Honmichi. Aijirō claimed to be the living Kanrodai, i.e., the true successor to the Tenrikyō organization whose arrival was preordained according to his newfound understanding of Tenrikyō scriptures. As mentioned above, the Kanrodai was the pillar marking the Jiba where Miki's eschatological vision was to be materialized and Aijirō introduced the innovative doctrine that added a biological Kanrodai to Tenrikyō cosmology. As a result, Tenrikyō leadership was prompted to expel Aijirō from the organization.

Aijirō's claims to be a new prophet resonated with disenfranchised followers and missionaries during Tenrikyō's postcharismatic phase. By that point the Tenrikyō institution adopted numerous compromises with State Shintō in order for it to be recognized as an independent Kyōha Shintō sect. As it became clear to Aijirō's movement that his claims to the leadership of the Tenrikyō institution were never going to materialize by Tenrikyō, the members of the nascent religious organization embraced a defiant stance against the imperial government.

— Chapter One —  
The Emergence of Tenrikyō and the Sukezō Jiken

In the middle of his account on the Sukezō jiken of 1865, Tenrikyō minister Matsutani Takekazu describes his two visits to Harigabessho, the village where the confrontation between Nakayama Miki and Imai Sukezō occurred.

The place in question, Harigabessho Village, is presently along the new Meihan Expressway. To go there, exit the Hari Interchange and drive about two kilometers north on Route 369. Turn east onto a narrow country road and the village that will come into view is Harigabessho.

In 1971, the year I was an instructor for a term at Shūyōka,<sup>19</sup> Konishi Shigeoki, my colleague from Miyako Daikyōkai gave me a tour [to Harigabessho]. I made this first visit together with a few of my peers. We went there by way of a mountain road that went through Takimoto and Nagataki villages. The road suddenly went up a steep slope and it was dangerously narrow in a few areas. I thought to myself: What a frightening place we had come to.

When coming from the expressway, one can see a wooden worship hall (*kyōdō* 教堂) where there hangs a sign that reads “Tenrin-Ō-Kyōkai Honbu.” East of the building up on a hill sit the remains of Sukezō’s home (Matsutani 2001, 65).

When Rev. Matsutani revisited the scene again in 1979, he noted,

Imai Sukezō’s residence had not changed in the nearly ten years since my last visit. The worship hall was a sturdy structure and there were no sign of any rain leakage.

As I gazed inside toward the altar, to both the left and right of the dark worship area, I saw two paper lanterns inscribed with the characters “Tenrin-Ō”

---

<sup>19</sup> The three-month Spiritual Development Course sponsored by Tenrikyo Church Headquarters.

hanging from the ceiling. The scene carries a strong flavor of an amalgamation of kami/Buddha worship (*shinbutsu konkō* 神仏混淆).

At that moment I wondered: When was this worship hall built? Was it already built when the Foundress visited here or was it constructed later? Yet there is no one here who can answer my questions (*ibid.* 67).

Here Rev. Matsutani presents a recent look at the state of the schism that was initiated by Imai Sukezō. Yet it is worthy to note that, in his description of the worship hall at Harigabessho, Rev. Matsutani seems to convey unfamiliarity with widespread Shugendō and Yoshida Shintō institutional expressions of Shintō-Buddhist combinations that were largely eliminated in the early Meiji period.<sup>20</sup> Though Sukezō's residence has since been demolished, Rev. Matsutani offers a glimpse back into the past when Nakayama Miki's movement was only a small, local phenomenon that lacked the ritual expressions it has today.

In this chapter, I will describe the formation of Tenrikyō until the Sukezō jiken and detail the manner Miki dealt with this heresy. Imai Sukezō's attempt to form a religious organization of his own is significant in that it occurred during Tenrikyō's formative stages while Miki was still physically present. Though Miki was yet to formulate her ideas through scripture, Tenrikyō's hagiographic materials illustrate that she already had clear boundaries that determined the orthodox importance of the Jiba and how it could not be replaced or rendered inferior by another sacred space. The same sources depict Miki had considered the centrality of the Jiba as a binding tenet for her followers at an early stage in the process of Tenrikyō's self-definition.

---

<sup>20</sup> According to Mark Teeuwen and Fabio Rambelli, *shinbutsu konkō* tends to have a derogatory implication meaning "randomness and bastardisation" (42). *Shinbutsu shūgō* 神仏習合 represents a more neutral terminology that refers to Shintō-Buddhist assimilation. However, in Matsutani's case here, I would argue that he is using *shinbutsu konkō* to describe what he sees as 'unprecedented' or 'unnatural.'

The Sukezō jiken also came to be known as the *honji suijaku* 本地垂迹 *jiken*, as Sukezō depended on a geographic reinterpretation of this Buddhist doctrine to legitimize his activities and promote the religious superiority of his sacred space over Miki's. Buddhist religionists often utilized the *honji suijaku* argument to classify their deities as the original sources whereas local kami were only 'manifest traces' of these buddhas. Thus the *honji suijaku* doctrine has been noted for its "Buddhist triumphalism" (Reader and Tanabe 1998, 148). The significance of the Sukezō jiken also lies in the fact that it eventually motivated Miki to formally and explicitly express her religious doctrine in normative scripture and liturgical dance.

The Sukezō jiken is a power struggle that can be approached from two different perspectives. The first perspective details Tenrikyō's view of the incident as an intolerable heresy. Because it was the first schism in the history of Tenrikyō, the Sukezō jiken was a defining moment for early followers. It represents Miki's religious might over an ex-follower who dared to imitate her and attempted to initiate a following of his own. As a historical event, it continues to provide a didactic function for the religion.

The second perspective I present shows the Sukezō jiken as one particular event in a series of conflicts Shugendō had against Yoshida Shintō and "newly emerging religious associations" such as Tenrikyō (Hardacre 1994). Miki was involved in a number of confrontations with Shugendō practitioners and the Sukezō jiken could be seen as another example of this. The indirect involvement of Moriya Chikuzen, the head Yoshida Shintō official of Yamato Province as Miki's potential patron at this time offset the challenge presented by Sukezō and his Shugendō supporters. In other words, the incident not only presents a founder chastising a former follower, but an indirect battle between the two



patrons Tōzan-ha Shugendō and Yoshida Shintō. I would also like to suggest that Sukezō's challenge was a failed attempt by Tōzan-ha yamabushi to reestablish Miki's kami Tenri-Ō-no-Mikoto under their direct sponsorship with a honji suijaku argument. However, before describing the Sukezō jiken, I would like to summarize the major events that led up to this incident. After an analysis of the Sukezō jiken itself, I will examine the immediate implications of this watershed event and describe the fortunes of Tenrikyō, Shugendō, and Sukezō's movement following the inauguration of the Meiji era in 1868.

### **The initiation of the obiya-yurushi**

While Miki experienced her initial kamigakari in 1838, it was not until 1854, the year after her husband's death, that she began an active religious career. Until this time Miki had followed the orders of the kami that entered her and plunged into the depths of poverty, giving away the Nakayama family fortune through acts of charity to initiate the 'path of universal salvation.' Zenbei's inability to curb his wife from exhausting the Nakayama wealth disgusted his relatives and peers, which led to the Nakayama household's estrangement from village society.

Miki first granted the obiya-yurushi (Grant of Safe Childbirth) to her daughters Kajimoto Haru in 1854 and Fukui Masa in 1855 (Nakayama Y. 1986, 37-38).<sup>21</sup> Though it was not until 1858 when Miki offered the obiya-yurushi to a woman outside her family, by 1862 and 1863, Miki became renown in Yamato Province as a kami of safe childbirth.

---

<sup>21</sup> Although it is a convention in Tenrikyō English texts (LO, Nakayama Y. 1986, etc.) to write women's names with the honorific prefix "O," I chose to follow the guidelines of the *Tenrikyō jiten* and drop the honorific.

Miki is said to have stated the following about the obi-ya-yurushi, “I grant this from the Residence as proof of the origin of mankind—[from] the Parent of Origin, the Jiba of Origin” (*ibid.* 40). Thus the tradition maintains that Miki’s powers were ultimately derived from Tenri-Ō-no-Mikoto, ‘the Parent of Origin’ (*moto no Oya*), the creator of human beings, and the ‘Residence’ (*yashiki*), i.e., the Nakayama household, was the very place where humanity was conceived. Miki also urged expectant mothers to reject the prevailing childbearing customs of the times.

Such childbearing practices included wearing an abdominal band or sash, dietary taboos, and a belief in a period of seventy-five days postpartum of ritual pollution (*kegare*) that followed childbirth. It has been surmised that the term ‘*obiya*’ 帯屋 either refers to this abdominal sash or is a Yamato dialectic corruption of ‘*ubuya*’ 産屋, a room that had its tatami mats removed in special preparation for childbirth (TJ 129). The obi-ya was worn with the belief that it would help keep the developing fetus from growing too large and risk the mother in delivery (Matsuda 264). In the ‘*ubuya*’ birthrooms, “straw was laid and *goza* or a straw mattress was put on it. And on a thick layer of rags [the mothers] bore children” (*ibid.* 263). The seventy-five day taboo required foods for the mother to be cooked in a separate pot and forbade her from going outside or even entering any room with tatami (*ibid.* 263-264). In this sense, Miki’s obi-ya-yurushi represents a ‘liberation’ (*yurushi*) from such childbearing customs in more ways than one.

Certainly the obi-ya-yurushi would have been perceived as a blessing from heaven for expectant mothers during the late Tokugawa period. “In those days when the taboos were imperative, this meant quite a drastic reform and a new

kind of relief" (*ibid.* 264). Murakami Shigeyoshi attributes the appeal of the obi-ya-yurushi to the rejection of the impractical restriction on women that they refrain from stepping out of their ubuya for seventy-five days. The farmers of Yamato needed all the help that was available and young women were considered a vital source of manual labor (Murakami 1975, 46). Lastly and most importantly, due to the lack of current medical knowledge, there loomed the constant danger that the birthing process could lead to the death of the mother and/or child.

The effectiveness of the obi-ya-yurushi drew many women to Miki, and there were times where she herself made missionary visits. 1862 saw the first time Miki traveled outside her village of Shōyashiki to Ando Village to save a woman who was suffering from post-delivery complications (KTK 43). Miki's growing reputation also attracted the attention of a local medium of Inari who demanded compensation for lost income, which Miki readily consented to. This incident would only provide a hint of the types of opposition Miki would experience in the near future.

However, Miki did not limit herself to only relieving women from the rigors of childbirth and their postnatal complications. She would readily relieve any person of any physical anxiety that they happened to have. Still, despite her widening repute as a living kami of safe childbirth and healer of illness, Miki's movement shows the signs of being what Stark and Bainbridge would describe as a 'client cult.' Miki's healings and grants providing safe childbirth fall under the category of 'magical services' and 'specific compensators' that—according to Rodney Stark and William Sims Bainbridge—would limit the relationship between Miki and the people she attracted to therapist/patient or consultant/client relations (1985, 26; 209). Yet in time, it became clear that Miki

had grander aspirations, which gradually came to fruition as she assembled a small, loyal band of followers around her.

**Evolution from 'client cult' to 'cult movement':  
the conversion of Yamanaka, Iburi, and Yamazawa**

1864 proved to be a decisive year in the history of Miki's growing movement, for it was the year when she gained the loyalty of three influential men. From about this time, we see that Miki began to attract more than 'clients' but actual followers engaging in what Stark describes as "a long-term exchange relationship with the divine" which "enables religious movements to require long-term stable patterns of participation" (1996, 135). This led the way for the evolution of Miki's nascent religious movement from a 'client cult' into a 'cult movement.' (A 'cult movement' is another term coined by Stark and Bainbridge to refer to "full-fledged religious organizations that attempt to satisfy all the religious needs of converts" (1985, 29).) Though they were not the first of her devoted followers, Yamanaka Chūshichi, Iburi Izō, and Yamazawa Ryōsuke soon surpassed the others in the respective contributions they delivered and remained steadfast in the face of escalating social tension.

Yamanaka Chūshichi was a wealthy landowner and held an important position in his village. He was an important follower who helped finance the construction (Murakami 1975, 49) of the *Tsutome-basho* (Place for the Service), which would be used as Tenrikyō's first sanctuary, in use until the construction of the present North Worship Hall in 1913. Miki gained Chūshichi's devotion when she helped his wife Sono recover from a severe case of hemorrhoids. When he first visited Miki on the behalf of his wife in the first lunar month of 1864, Chūshichi was told,

You have an *innen* with God and God has drawn you to this Residence. You need not worry about your wife's condition. I will save her in an instant, but in return, you must be willing to serve God (A #11, 7).

Yamazawa Ryōsuke (also known as Ryōjirō) is said to have joined at about the same time, since Sono, Chūshichi's wife, was his sister (Matsutani 2001, 63). Ryōsuke's waka version of the *Doroumi Kōki* (often called the *Meiji jūyo-nen wakatai-bon*) he composed in 1881 would later be one of the more highly regarded and widely disseminated versions of the Tenrikyo cosmogony (Murakami 1974, 268). Though Ryōsuke's contributions were not immediately apparent nor appreciated today as much as the contributions of Chūshichi and Izō, they are connected with a number of significant events which will be discussed in detail below.

Iburi Izō was the carpenter who helped in the actual construction of the Tsutome-basho and would eventually succeed Miki as the spiritual leader of Tenrikyō after her passing. Izō was regarded a sincere and honest man and is most revered today over all of Miki's disciples as a model follower.

Izō initially sought Miki's help in the fifth lunar month of 1864 for his wife Sato who suffered from the aftereffects of her second miscarriage. Though Izō employed the help of doctors, Sato's condition only grew worse. Once he heard about the blessings granted by 'a kami in Shōyashiki,' he departed from his home in Ichinomoto and traveled south to inquire at the Residence.

It has been widely documented that Miki awaited Izō's arrival with great anticipation. Before Izō reached his destination, Miki had uttered the following prediction, "A carpenter will appear, will appear" (LO 40). Upon receiving several 'doses' of sacred barley flour for his wife from Miki's daughter Kokan,

Izō returned home and Sato removed her abdominal sash and consumed the flour and was on her way to a swift recovery.

Because Izō lost his first wife Natsu to post-delivery complications (Tenrikyō Dōyūsha 1997, 17), one can imagine the extent and depth of his gratitude for Sato's recovery. Izō instantly became an ardent follower and with the suggestion from Sato to express their appreciation in concrete form, it was decided that he build a place of worship for Miki's fast growing following. Izō's construction of the Tsutome-basho is still considered a very significant contribution in the history of Tenrikyō. Its construction is a prominent theme in Song Three of the *Mikagura-uta*. However, before the Tsutome-basho could be completed, a significant setback would test the resolve of the early group of followers in the tenth lunar month of 1864.

### The 'Ōyamato Jinja no fushi' and its implications

The offer by the Iburis of building a place of worship was enthusiastically received and the followers quickly acted to bring the plan into reality. A number of followers who stayed behind after the monthly gathering on the twenty-sixth of the eighth lunar month of 1864 held a meeting about the prospect of construction and chipped in to raise the funds of five ryō. The money was used as a deposit to buy building materials. The ground-breaking ceremony was celebrated on the thirteenth of the ninth lunar month and the raising of the ridge-beam (*mune-age*) on the twenty-sixth of the tenth lunar month, the day of the anniversary of Tenrikyō's founding. The raising of the beam of the Tsutome-basho was a festive occasion celebrated with much fanfare. The celebration continued into the night. As the followers were celebrating with little *sake* to go

around, Yamanaka Chūshichi invited a number of followers to his home in Mamekoshi Village to continue the celebration the next day. The followers asked for Miki's permission to go, to which she readily consented, adding "be sure to pay your respects when you pass before a shrine" (Nakayama Y. 1986, 66).

The party heading to Mamekoshi included Miki's son Shūji 秀司, Izō, Chūshichi, and nine others. Before the group of followers could reach Mamekoshi, however, they became involved in an incident known as the first '*Ōyamato Jinja no fushi*,' or 'trouble at Ōyamato Shrine' (described in KTK 55-59; Nakayama Shōzen 1936, 1: 47-52; Nakayama Y. 1987, 289-294). As they passed the historical Ōyamato Jinja, they remembered Miki's words and proceeded to 'pay their respects' by loudly banging on a drum they carried, chanting "Namu Tenri-Ō-no-Mikoto" in front of the shrine torii.

Little did the followers realize that Moriya Chikuzen-no-kami,<sup>22</sup> the superintendent of Yoshida Shintō in Yamato Province, was in the middle of conducting a special seven-day prayer upon his return from Kyoto. Priests of the Ōyamato Jinja came bolting out to seize the drum and detained the followers for three days, believing that the party had intentionally come to interrupt Moriya's prayers.<sup>23</sup>

News of the incident spread quickly to Mamekoshi, Shōyashiki, and other neighboring villages. Those who were left behind at the Nakayama household were powerless to intervene, while relatives and acquaintances who were in a position to negotiate the release of the detainees showed intense reluctance to

---

<sup>22</sup> Moriya Chikuzen's surname before the Meiji Restoration was Morimoto (Hatakama 1991a, 128). He came to be called 'Moriya' after serving as priest of the Moriya Jinja (TJ 902).

<sup>23</sup> It has been suggested that Moriya's prayers at Ōyamato Jinja were specifically aimed at expelling foreign barbarians (*jōi*), which would explain the swift reaction of the Shintō priests (KNH 127).

become involved (Nakayama Shōzen 1936, 1: 48 and 50). It was only when Kishi Jinshichi came as a representative of the head of Ichinomoto Village that the party finally learned the reason they were being held (*ibid.* 48). Yamazawa Ryōsuke also arrived to attempt to negotiate with Moriya Chikuzen, who was his relative.<sup>24</sup> In the end, the party had no choice but to apologize and bear the expenses incurred by their stay. They were also required to sign a written pledge to never approach a prestigious shrine such as Ōyamato Jinja again (KTK 58).

The incident proved to be an embarrassing outcome for many of those involved. The majority of the followers who were detained stopped worshiping at the Residence, either out of fear or anger. The notable exceptions were Chūshichi and Izō. A follower named Gihei, who placed the order for the roof tiles meant for Tsutome-basho also was persuaded to cease his faith even though he was not with the group that headed for Mamekoshi. When Miki overheard Kokan mutter to herself that they should not have left in the first place, she instructed her daughter, “Do not complain. The present hardship will soon be overcome and prove a good topic of conversation for generations to come” (Nakayama Shōzen 1964, 39). Despite Kokan’s reservations concerning the incident, Miki recognized that the trouble at Ōyamato Jinja served as an opportunity for less devoted followers to exit the back door so to speak, and functioned as a process of “letting go... those who don’t fit in” (Stark 1996, 143).

Though the damage done at Ōyamato Jinja hampered the formation of a religious association (kō) for the time being, Izō slowly and diligently continued to work on the construction of the Tsutome-basho. Izō also settled matters with

---

<sup>24</sup> Matsutani (2001, 63) claims they were cousins while the *Tenrikyō jiten* claims that it was an uncle-nephew relation (TJ 916). However, if we take into account the claim that Moriya’s wife Kimi was the sister of Yamanaka (formerly Yamazawa) Sono (TJ 902), this would make them in-laws.



the lumber and roof tile suppliers so debts could be handled at a later time. Chūshichi continued his support as well, albeit reluctantly (Nakayama Shōzen 1936, 1: 53-54) and the Tsutome-basho was completed in early 1865.

The trouble at Ōyamato Jinja further provided Miki access to Moriya Chikuzen-no-kami, who visited her in 1865. Moriya certainly intended his visit as an investigation into the leader of the party who unceremoniously disturbed his prayers the year before. Undoubtedly Moriya must have been curious about the new religious movement his relative Ryōsuke was involved with. Upon his visit, Moriya was said to have been greatly impressed by Miki's teachings and recommended that she obtain a license for her religious activities (Takano 2001, 153).

Members of the Moriya family were direct descendants of the Mononobe clan and Chikuzen was of the sixty-first generation. On top of his duties as a supervising priest in Yamato Province, Moriya Chikuzen was also a chief administrator within Yoshida Shintō who would be deeply involved in gaining legal recognition for Miki's movement which lasted until the office controlled by the Yoshida family was abolished in 1870. Moriya was also closely involved in local campaigns to eradicate Buddhism (*haibutsu undō*) and with efforts to remove himself and fellow priests from the *danka* or temple-parishioner system (Hatakama 1991a, 128-129). As Moriya strove to bring Miki's movement under his patronage, the Sukezō jiken provided an opportunity for him to slowly establish his influence. According to Murakami Shigeyoshi, Moriya's assistance "proved to be greatly effective" as Miki suppressed Sukezō's heresy (1975, 50).

## The Sukezō jiken

My main source of reference for the Sukezō jiken is the official hagiography of Nakayama Miki by Tenrikyō Church Headquarters, the *Kōhon Tenrikyō Kyōsoden* (or simply *Kyōsoden*, hereafter abbreviated as KTK), translated into English as *The Life of Oyasama, the Foundress of Tenrikyo* (abbreviated as LO). First published in 1956, the *Kyōsoden* was based on materials from the late 1890s and a cumulation of sixty years of research by a number of Tenrikyō scholars and theologians. I will quote the description of the Sukezō jiken from the English translation of the *Kyōsoden* in its entirety below while referring to other sources (OYKH; Moroi; Nakayama Shōzen 1936 and 1964; Nakayama Y. 1986 and 1987) for supplemental information. The description begins as follows:

About the July or August of the same year [1865], the path was opened to Fukusumi Village. Among the many people who returned to the Residence to worship was Sukezo of Harigabessho Village. He had been saved by Oyasama [i.e., Nakayama Miki] from an eye disease. For some time after that, he frequently returned to the Residence. In the course of time, however, he suddenly stopped coming to the Residence and began to say that the village of Harigabessho was the original dwelling place of God (*honchi* or *honji*), whereas the village of Shoyashiki was the place where God was temporarily manifested (*suijaku*) (LO 51).

It is described that Imai Sukezō initially was a fervent follower who regularly worshiped at the Residence for two months after he was healed (Nakayama Shōzen 1936, 1: 61). He suddenly stopped his worship and began to invoke the will of Tenri-Ō-no-Mikoto, offering the obiya-yurushi and other grants and prayers from his home, which attracted a number of followers in the process (Moroi 59). He began to claim his household was the *honji*, the true 'dwelling place of God' and that Miki's Residence in Shōyashiki was only

temporary abode or *suijaku*. Sukezō's claim of legitimacy clearly reveals a type of Buddhist triumphalism which can be attributed to his patrons, the Koizumi Fudōin. While Miki did not immediately act to confront Sukezō for his 'heresy,' there was no way she could accept his claim of superiority from the very start. Miki considered her ritual grant, the *obiya-yurushi*, as 'proof' of the Jiba as the original homeland, the birthplace of the first humans at creation, and the source of Tenri-Ō-no-Mikoto's salvation.

From about September 20, Oyasama took no meals at all, saying:

I grow neither thin nor weak, so long as I drink water.

Those around Her grew more concerned for Her health daily and repeatedly pleaded with Her to take some food. But all She took was a small portion of vegetables and some sweet rice wine (*mirin*).

Around October 20, after fasting for about thirty days, Oyasama suddenly announced that She intended to proceed to Harigabessho Village. She left the Residence that very day, attended by Izo Iburi, Chushichi Yamanaka, Isaburo Nishida, and Jujiro Okamoto, and arrived at an inn in Harigabessho Village at about nine o'clock in the evening.

The next morning She said to Iburi and Yamanaka:

Go and clear it away!

The two men hastened to the house of Sukezo, and plunging into its inner chamber, snapped the *gohei* in two, and threw it into the kitchen stove to burn it (LO 51-52).

It is described elsewhere that Sukezō was initially "delighted" when he heard of Miki's arrival in Harigabessho (Nakayama Shōzen 1936, 1: 63; Nakayama Y. 1986, 78; 1987, 307). He believed that Miki came to acknowledge

his claims for legitimacy. However, Miki's entourage did not waste much time before revealing the true purpose of their visit.

There is a discrepancy between Moroi's account and all of the others. Moroi names Izō, Chūshichi, Tsuji (Chūsaku) and Masui (Isaburō) as members of Miki's entourage to Harigabessho (Moroi 60). While this may lead me to be slightly apprehensive when dealing with information that I find only in his account, I believe this difference—Tsuji and Masui being part of the entourage instead of Nishida and Okamoto—actually highlights the significance of the role Izō and Chūshichi play in this event. Miki specifically orders Izō and Chūshichi to 'clear away' the *gohei* (or Shintō-style staff with paper streamers) Sukezō was using as an object of worship. Since Miki bestowed what was called the *gohei no sazuke* to a number of her closest followers that included Izō and Chūshichi, it can be assumed that the *gohei* they destroyed was originally granted to Sukezō by Miki. By destroying the *gohei* which Miki gave to Sukezō to enshrine Tenri-Ō-no-Mikoto in his home, Izō and Chūshichi take the initial step in dealing with Sukezō's heresy.

During Nakayama Miki's lifetime, 'Sazuke' was a generic term that referred to a series of grants that she bestowed on her followers. These included the Sazuke of the Fan (*ōgi no sazuke*), the Sazuke of the Gohei, the Sazuke of Fertilizer (*koe no sazuke*) among others. In the spring of 1864, Miki began to distribute the first of these Sazuke grants, the *ōgi no sazuke*, to about fifty to sixty persons. This grant was also called the Invocation of the Fan (*ōgi no ukagai*). With this grant, followers were endowed with the ability to inquire the will of God through a fan they received from Miki through interpreting the movements of the fan that was said to move on its own upon the utterance of a prayer. Another use of the *ōgi no sazuke* was specifically for the sake of inquiring the

prognosis of an ill person (TJ 103). The follower who received the *ōgi no sazu* would place the fan on his lap and silently contemplate over the ill person's present state. It was said one could then interpret whether or not there would be a recovery according to the direction the fan happened to move. On top of its use as an object of worship, the *gohei no sazu* was also utilized in a similar manner to that of the *ōgi no sazu* to invoke the will of God the Parent.

Miki's fast is viewed by various commentators as evidence of how serious she regarded Sukezō's heresy. Sukezō was abusing the grant Miki bestowed for his use to attract a following of his own. He also began to offer grants in the same manner Miki did and legitimized his actions with claims of Harigabessho's superiority as the geographical honji over Shōyashiki, the geographical suijaku. From Miki's standpoint, this was not something she would easily let pass without a confrontation. In the text it is suggested Miki began her fast with the intention to confront Sukezō. Miki's ability to endure her fast only with the nourishment of a few vegetables and *sake* that was offered to the kami (*omiki*) also provided her an opportunity to demonstrate her divine power to her followers.

Returning to the inn, [Iburi and Yamanaka] reported the result to Oyasama and began to talk among themselves about whether they might go home now. Then Oyasama interrupted them and said:

We should not leave now.

Sukezo also insisted that he could not allow them to leave yet. Meanwhile, a monk from the Kongoin Temple came from Nara by palanquin to aid Sukezo, while Ryōjiro Yamazawa [i.e., Yamazawa Ryōsuke] arrived at the village as a proxy of Moriya Chikuzen-no-kami to assist the party from the Residence. Then both sides began to negotiate.

But the merits of the case were self-evident from the first, no matter how Sukezo might twist the story. First, it was a solid fact that he had been saved by Oyasama, so solid, in fact, that there was no possible justification for even a hint of ingratitude on his part. As for his doctrine that asserted that Harigabessho Village was the original dwelling place of God, it was by no means a doctrine that could be successfully pursued in the presence of Oyasama. Thus, by the third day of the negotiations, the monk and Sukezo finally found themselves driven into a corner and humbly begged for Her pardon, acknowledging that they had been in the wrong. It took about seven days to settle the matter completely.

At Her departure, Sukezo made presents to Oyasama of one thousand Tenpo iron coins, one horseload of charcoal, and one pair of cast-iron lanterns, and he hired carriers to take them to the Residence (LO 52-53).

Once Izō and Chūshichi threw Sukezō's gohei into the fire and returned, they felt the matter was settled as Sukezō no longer had in his possession the ritual artifact that enshrined Tenri-Ō-no-Mikoto in his home. However, Miki correctly sensed that their task was far from over. Naturally, Sukezō was deeply angered by the loss of his gohei and threatened to take Miki and her entourage to Nara to have them punished (Nakayama Shōzen 1936, 1: 65; OYKH 7A). Sukezō then responded by dispatching a messenger to have the head monk of the Koizumi Fudōin who happened to be in Nara at the time to come to his aid (*ibid.*).

While the involvement of the Koizumi Fudōin is not mentioned in the *Kyōsoden*, according to the notes of Nakayama Shinnosuke, the grandson of Miki and first patriarch (*Shinbashira*) of Tenrikyō, Sukezō was affiliated with this temple (*Fudōin no buzoku nareba* 不動院ノ部属ナレバ) (*ibid.*) and thus requested its help. With this evidence, Murakami Shigeyoshi comes to the conclusion that Sukezō enshrined Tenrin-Ō, the wheel-turning king of the Tōzan-ha denomination of Shugendō in his home with the help of the Koizumi Fudōin

(1975, 50-51). However, Murakami fails to make any mention of the Kongōin's involvement. Although my suggestion cannot be proved conclusively, upon reading Shinnosuke's narrative, my intuition leads me to believe that while Sukezō's patron was the Fudōin, the head monk of the Kongōin arrived to assist him instead because the Kongōin were familiar and experienced in dealing with Miki. Though Sukezō dispatched his messenger to Nara for the head of his patron temple, the Fudōin, a monk from the Kongōin arrived instead.<sup>25</sup>

The monks of the Kongōin were no strangers to Miki. According to the *Kyōsoden*, they initiated an encounter with her in early 1864 during her third visit to Ando Village (KTK 46-47). When Miki visited Ando the year before, she had helped save the son of landowner Iida Zenroku,<sup>26</sup> which secured his devotion. Miki returned in 1864 and stayed at his residence for forty days, attracting many people who came to inquire for her aid. This provoked Furukawa Bungo, a doctor from Namimatsu Village,<sup>27</sup> to come to the Iida home together with monks from the Kongōin to confront her. This incident marked the first of similar confrontations Tenrikyō faced in the waning years of the Tokugawa period. Furukawa had studied Yoshida Shintō in addition to western medicine and regularly frequented shrines such as Ōmiwa and Ōyamato (Takano 2001, 155-

<sup>25</sup> While the Fudōin is mentioned twice in Nakayama Shinnosuke's account (titled *Okina yori kikishi hanashi* or OYKH and entirely based Iburī Izō's oral narrative as Shinnosuke was yet to be born at the time of the Sukezō jiken), Tenrikyō scholars appear to regard these as typographical errors. The majority of scholars who have commented on this text, while quoting Shinnosuke's account as it is, fail to acknowledge any mention of the Fudōin (Matsutani 2001, 66; KNH). One theologian who quotes this passage actually replaces the two occurrences of 'Fudōin' with 'Kongōin,' (Hatakama 1991a, 130) which may suggest a bias in Tenrikyō scholarship that ignores the suggestion the Koizumi Fudōin was involved in the Sukezō affair. Confounding the difficulty determining whether monks from the Fudōin or Kongōin (or both) were involved in the incident is the fact that the lone phrase mentioning the Kongōin ("The head of the Kongōin arrived in a palanquin" 金剛院ハ乗物ニ乗りて来る) was clearly added by Shinnosuke as an afternote after he wrote the majority of the text (see OYKH 7A).

<sup>26</sup> Iida Zenroku's son was the young Iwajirō—an episode which will be discussed in more detail in the next chapter.

<sup>27</sup> Also read "Nanmatsu" (Takano 2001, 155).

156). Furukawa and the Kongōin monks must have felt threatened by Miki's growing following and the loss of income which resulted from her religious activities.

As Furukawa and the monks approached Miki and mocked her as a fox spirit, Miki remained calm, and countered, "Ask! if you have anything to ask" (LO 38). Though Furukawa presented Miki with "difficult questions one after another," she responded to each with such eloquence and an air of authority that Furukawa "prostrated himself, filled with awe, and, humbly withdrawing himself... went away" (*ibid.*). The Kongōin monks left in disgust once they saw Furukawa, their representative in the confrontation, defeated in this manner. The Kongōin may have been waiting for an opportunity to gain the upper hand when the Sukezō jiken presented itself.

This encounter between Miki and the party consisting of Furukawa and the Kongōin monks is presented in Helen Hardacre's essay on the confrontations of Shugendō against Tenrikyō and other 'newly emerging religious associations' (Hardacre 1994). The *Kyōsoden* itself is not clear on the affiliation of the Kongōin.<sup>28</sup> In Tenrikyō sources, only Moroi gives any hint of the sectarian affiliation of the Kongōin by calling the monk in the Sukezō jiken a 'yamabushi' (60). Hardacre, in her translation of the *Kyōsoden* in her essay, identifies the monks accompanying Furukawa as shugenja and gives no evidence for this attribution (1994, 138).

I initially had grave doubts over whether the Nara Kongōin ever existed, since I found no records of a temple by that name in Nara. As late as 1956, Tenrikyō scholars had to admit they did not have any information about where

---

<sup>28</sup> The *Kyōsoden* just identifies the monks as "*Nara no Kongōin no mono*" (KTK 47).



this Nara Kongōin could have been located (Nakayama Shōzen 1999, 199). However, a commentary on the *Kyōsoden* that was written since then claims that the Kongōin was one of the ninety-six *shi-in* 子院 (priests' living quarters) of Kōfukuji that was destroyed in 1872 during the Buddhist oppression (*haibutsu kishaku*) of the early Meiji era (Yamochi 1984, 121).

Traditionally Kōfukuji has been known as the head temple of the Hossō school. While he admits the evidence is "fragmentary" and "indirect or circumstantial," Royall Tyler has nevertheless discovered a forgotten connection between the Kōfukuji and the Shugendō Tōzan-ha (174). Tyler notes the existence of a fourteenth century record—whose title acknowledges the Kōfukuji to be the main temple (*honji* 本寺) of the Tōzan-ha (*ibid.* 144)—that names a number of yamabushi as practioner monks (*dōshū* 堂衆; also called *zenshū* 禪衆) of the East and West Kondō of Kōfukuji who took care of Kasuga Jinja subshrines in the Kasuga hills (*ibid.* 149). Further, the action taken by the Kongōin to support Sukezō, an affiliated member of the Koizumi Fudōin, implies another connection with the Tōzan-ha. Therefore, the suggestions of Hardacre and Moroi that the Kongōin was comprised of yamabushi may have an actual basis according to Tyler's study.

In Japan, Shugendō temples "were an established presence in the communities of virtually all areas of the country. Thus it is not to be expected that they would tolerate unauthorized competition from the New Religions, which after all lacked the legal sanction enjoyed by Shugendō" (Hardacre 1994, 141). This is especially so when we take into consideration Shugendō priests were not allowed by the shogunate to perform funerals, which provided a stable and lucrative source of income for other Buddhist institutions (Hardacre 2002,

44). Shugendō practitioners thus were all the more protective of their interests to maintain control over the performance of rituals for the attainment of *genze riyaku* (this-worldly or practical benefits).

The Koizumi Fudōin had unwritten but widely acknowledged monopoly rights over conducting prayers and incantations (*kitō* 祈祷) in Yamato Province, and Miki was healing the sick and bestowing the obiya-yurushi without their consent (Takano 2001, 158).<sup>29</sup> On top of being a source of competition for religious clientele, it could be suggested that in the eyes of Tōzan-ha practitioners, Miki illegitimately co-opted Tenri-Ō-no-Mikoto as her patron kami from the popular worship of the Ten Kings (*jū-ō* 十王) established within Shugendō. Murakami Shigeyoshi has made the claim that Nakano Ichibei, the yamabushi who performed the *yose-kaji* rite that led to Miki's initial kamigakari was a priest of the Tōzan-ha-affiliated Uchiyama-Eikyūji 内山永久寺 that "particularly promoted the cult of the Ten Kings" (Hardacre 1994, 154).<sup>30</sup>

Miki's lack of legal status and her religious activities which she initiated in the name of Tenri-Ō would have provoked Shugendō into protecting their economic and religious interests in northern Yamato Province. Murakami insists that in her lifetime Miki called her kami *Tenrin-Ō* instead of Tenri-Ō-no-Mikoto as it is written in Tenrikyō texts. Murakami states that it was only natural for Miki—who was a committed devotee of Jōdo-shū early in her life<sup>31</sup>—to call her

<sup>29</sup> Hardacre describes *kitō* as "a catchball term for prayers for healing, well-being, prosperity, and other this-worldly benefits" (1989, 74).

<sup>30</sup> Tenrikyō theologian Iida Teruaki has argued that Nakano Ichibei's connection to Uchiyama-Eikyūji is highly suspect. He cites a source that relates Ichibei once trained at Mt. Hiei but became a local shugenja after wandering the countryside following his expulsion from a temple in Ōtsu for frequenting the red-light district (1991, 442-444).

<sup>31</sup> Miki is also known to have been initiated in the Jōdo-shū rite *gojū-sōden* 五重相伝 (the fivefold transmission) at the age of nineteen, a rare accomplishment for someone of that age. Refer to Nakayama Y. (1987, 118-127) for an account of Miki's experience and Kasahara (361-362) for general information on the *gojū-sōden* ritual.

kami Tenrin-Ō 転輪王, the wheel-turning king or *cakravartin* who was the *suijaku* of Amida Nyorai in the Buddhist pantheon (1975, 45). Other evidence found to support Murakami's assertion is that documents of Tenrikyō's early temporary legal engagements under Yoshida Shintō (the sanction to worship Tenrin-Ō-Myōjin 天輪王明神) and Shingon patronage (the establishment of Tenrin-Ō-Kōsha 転輪王講社) both included the appellation "Tenrin-Ō" (KTK 100; 148-149). Though it is impossible to determine with certainty whether or not Miki called her kami Tenrin-Ō, there is evidence affirming that her followers did.<sup>32</sup>

Miki's expansion into the local religious market and appropriation of Tenrin-Ō, the *suijaku* of Amida Nyorai, not only embittered yamabushi but Shinshū priests as well, as evidenced by Kokan's encounter with two monks from the Ta Hōrinji and Tainoshō Kōrenji in June 1865 (*ibid.* 62-63).<sup>33</sup> The Jōdo Shinshū monks barged in the Residence demanding, "How is it that you keep no light burning at dusk when you dare to assume the name of Tenri[n]-O-no-Mikoto?" (LO 50). What follows is a description similar to other Tenrikyō confrontations with Buddhist monks which appear in the *Kyōsoden*. The monks threateningly brandished their swords and fired off theological arguments while Miki's side kept their composure. Yet it remains an unfortunate fact that, apart

<sup>32</sup> Tenrikyō insists that the divine appellation Tenrin-Ō-no-Mikoto was a linguistic corruption of Tenri-Ō-no-Mikoto in the Yamato dialect, which is difficult to accept knowing that Miki—aside from a missionary trip to Kawachi—never left northern Yamato. However, they attempt to bolster this argument by the fact that "Tenrin-Ō" was rarely written as 転輪王 in documents written in Miki's lifetime but more commonly as 天輪王 or 天倫王 to consciously differentiate it from the Buddhist *cakravartin* (TJ 662). According to Hayasaka Masaaki, 転輪王 was only used during Tenrikyō's brief engagement with Shingon patronage between 1880 and 1882 (KNH 72). Yet it is worthy to note that in the hand movements of Song Nine, verse eight of the *Mikagura-uta* (Yattsu, yama no naka demo, achi kochi to, Tenri-Ō no Tsutome suru), the dancer points skyward with the right index finger and draws a halo (*rin* or *wa* 輪) with both index fingers during the singing of "Tenri-Ō no" (see Yamazawa T. 193).

<sup>33</sup> The Hōrinji 法林寺 and Kōrenji 光蓮寺 belonged to Nishi Honganji and Kōshōji-ha lineages of Jōdo Shinshū (TJ 325 and 822; Hori Y. 1177 and 1230).

the quote above, no record of any dialogue from these incidents has survived, and this applies to the confrontation between Sukezō and Miki as well.<sup>34</sup> Further, it is also curious to note that of all the opposition Miki faced from local Buddhist practitioners, there are no accounts of those she suffered at the hands of monks from Kōjōji 迎乗寺 (her natal family's parish temple), Zenpukuji 善福寺 (the Nakayama family parish temple), or Uchiyama-Eikyūji.

In the context of Tenrikyō's ongoing conflict with local Buddhist monks, Sukezō's transgression appears not as a renegade member attempting to create a movement of his own, but an active attempt by the Koizumi Fudōin to draw Miki's followers away from her and reestablish their territorial authority over religious activities in Yamato Province. The Sukezō jiken can be considered just one of many direct confrontations Miki's movement experienced with Shugendō monks.

Viewed in another way, the Sukezō jiken also proved to be an additional stage for Yoshida Shintō to build their prominence at the expense of Shugendō. While Miki mainly went to Harigabessho to admonish Sukezō for his heresy, the confrontation was also a battle between their mutual patrons. While Sukezō had a yamabushi on his side, Yamazawa Ryōsuke was brought by Okamoto for help. Acting as a personal representative of his relative Moriya Chikuzen, the leading Yoshida Shintō priest of Yamato Province, Ryōsuke provided a significant supporting role in the Sukezō affair.

Hardacre parallels the decline of Shugendō in the Tokugawa period with its growing susceptibility to challenges from Yoshida Shintō and New Religions.

---

<sup>34</sup> Aochi (1970, 130) also shares my sentiment. He attributes this to the inability of Miki's followers to fully grasp the theological arguments exchanged between Miki and her Buddhist critics.

Hardacre states: "By far the most widespread challenge to Tokugawa-period Shugendō came from Yoshida Shintō. Yoshida Shintō clashed with Shugendō in many areas with increasing frequency from the end of the eighteenth and into the nineteenth century over control of the miko and their considerable economic resources" (1994, 150). Miki's victory over Sukezō certainly symbolizes a victory for Moriya himself; Sukezō's defeat may be just one example of Shugendō's increasing inability to stand up to its Yoshida Shintō rivals and to New Religions.

Yet at the same time, it is important not to overemphasize these perspectives, as they may obscure the fact that Tenrikyō sources are quick to point out the severity with which Miki dealt with Sukezō compared with the manner she assumed during confrontations brought on by outside elements (Nakayama Shōzen 1999, 195; Yamochi 1984, 164). It was not important to Miki that Sukezō had support from the Kongōin or that her follower Ryōsuke was acting as the personal representative of Moriya Chikuzen. Her main concern was to admonish Sukezō for the "distorted" doctrine that he expounded. To elaborate on this point, theologian Nakayama Yoshikazu writes:

Hitherto, even when hostile adversaries had come to the Residence, often committing acts of violence, Oyasama had always calmly overlooked their transgressions. Besides offering no resistance Herself, She repeatedly warned Her followers: "Sidestep dust as you go along the Path." In contrast, Her attitude toward this incidence involving Sukezō was exceptionally severe, which indicates clearly the importance She placed on the truth (*ri* 理) of the One Jiba and portrays Her absolute refusal to allow this truth to be distorted (Nakayama Y. 1986, 81).

Thus in the eyes of the Tenrikyō faithful, the Sukezō jiken in many ways becomes an event that helps define their orthodox position on the significance of the Jiba.

In each of the sources that I have looked at, the sense is conveyed that Miki simply overwhelmed Sukezō and the Kongōin monk with her overpowering charisma. It soon became apparent that Sukezō was indebted to Miki and was in no actual position to claim greater authority. However, Sukezō was able to hold out for a couple of days. Moroi attributes this to the fact that the “yamabushi (i.e., the Kongōin monk) refused to surrender” (60). It also has been related that Miki entered a kamigakari state to secure her victory (OYKH 7A). In any case, Miki’s confrontation with Sukezō resulted in his defeat and he pleaded for her permission to chant the divine name (Moroi 60; Nakayama Y. 1987, 311). Miki consented and Sukezō presented her entourage with a number of goods as compensation as they victoriously returned to the Residence.

### Implications of the Sukezō jiken

One of the immediate implications of the Sukezō jiken was the further enhancement of Miki’s reputation as a religious figure. “Word of this confrontation spread quickly throughout the countryside, leading to reaffirm [her attendants’] belief that Oyasama was truly a ‘living god’ ” (Nakayama Y. 1986, 81).<sup>35</sup>

According to Murakami Shigeyoshi, the indirect assistance Miki received from Moriya Chikuzen during the Sukezō jiken led her to change the form of the Tenrikyō service (*Tsutome*) from the Buddhist-styled chant of ‘*Namu Tenrin-Ō*’ to a more Shintō-flavored prayer, ‘*Ashiki harai, tasuke tamae, Tenri-Ō-no-Mikoto*’

---

<sup>35</sup> Nakayama Yoshikazu also writes, “Seeing that Oyasama’s presence had brought Sukezō to his knees and that Her explanation of the teachings had devastated his schemes, Oyasama’s attendants were once again reminded of Oyasama’s greatness. In addition, this incident taught them the supreme importance of the truth of the Residence of Origin. Indeed, this knot (*fushi*, or ‘trouble’), provoked by a doctrine that had attempted to distort the truth of the Jiba, resulted instead in new buds of conviction that exalted this very truth” (Nakayama Y. 1986, 81).

(Sweep away evils, please save us, Tenri-Ō-no-Mikoto), in the autumn of 1866. This verse would become the first section of the Tenrikyō scripture and liturgy called the *Mikagura-uta*, which Miki continued to compose and revise until 1882. Murakami asserts, "...to Miki, the influence of Yoshida Shintō played a large role in helping her group confront Buddhism. Not long after the dispute with Sukezō, in order to challenge the established influence of Buddhism and Shugendō that dominated the religiosity of the peasants and satiated their desire for this-worldly benefits (*genze riyaku*), Miki chose the path to adopt a Shintō approach" (1975, 51). Certainly, the phrase '*Ashiki harai*' and addition of the title '*no-Mikoto*' to her patron kami may be a reflection of a 'Shintō flavor' in Miki's teachings. However, in his insistence to attribute Miki's first section of the *Mikagura-uta* to the influence of Yoshida Shintō, Murakami ignores a key historical incident which had close implications with the Sukezō jiken that occurred prior to Miki's composition.

According to the writings of Nakayama Shinnosuke, Miki composed the first section of the *Mikagura-uta* following an incident that also occurred in the autumn of 1866 (Fukaya 1995, 18). This incident involved two yamabushi monks from the Fudōin who barged into the Residence. This particular rowdy pair came before Miki and posed serious questions one by one. Frustrated that they could not gain an edge in making any profound theological arguments, the monks went on a rampage and began cutting hanging lanterns, drums, and tatami mats. They then proceeded to Mamekoshi village to Yamanaka Chūshichi's home to take the gohei that was enshrined there. Chūshichi was given severe blows to his head when he attempted to stop them. The two yamabushi then went to the office of the Furuichi Magistrate to issue a complaint about Miki's activities. As a result of this attack, Chūshichi was discouraged

from his regular worship at the Residence. Chūshichi did not visit the Residence unless it was the twenty-sixth of the month or when he has having personal troubles (Nakayama Shōzen 1936, 1: 67-68) and his enthusiasm remained dampened for some time.

I would like to suggest this attack by the Fudōin was their retaliation against Miki and Chūshichi for the confrontation with Sukezō the year before. Miki and her entourage crushed Sukezō's movement which enjoyed support from the Fudōin. The involvement of the Fudōin in the Sukezō jiken helps shed a completely new light on this incident that would not be apparent with just the account described in the *Kyōsoden*. While Miki herself remained composed during the attack by the Fudōin, she did feel the need for a proper response to this incident. Miki repeatedly told her followers to "Sidestep dust as you go along the Path" during the confrontations they experienced (Nakayama Y. 1986, 81).<sup>36</sup> With the hope that her followers would not become embroiled in increasing violence brought by outside opposition, Miki composed this apotropaic prayer for evils to be swept away from the hearts of humankind so Tenri-Ō-no-Mikoto could bring salvation to the world.

Another implication of the Sukezō jiken was that it compelled Miki to formally express the importance of the Jiba through the writing of a normative liturgy (*Mikagura-uta*) and scripture (*Ofudesaki*).<sup>37</sup> Still another related implication was Miki's banning of the *ōgi no sazuke* that possibly occurred about 1868 (TJ 369) due to the its potential for abuse by particular followers, with

---

<sup>36</sup> 'Dust' (*hokori*) was a common metaphor for evil (See Of I: 53)

<sup>37</sup> Theologian Serizawa Shigeru has suggested that *Ofudesaki* verse XI: 74, written in June 1875 ("Whatever I may say, it is all by Tsuki-Hi. You who are close to Me, imitate Me if you can"), refers to the Sukezō jiken (Serizawa 1983, 147). Another theologian, Hatakama Kazuhiro, attempts to explain the introduction of the *Mikagura-uta* in Weberian terms, that Miki's composition of the liturgy was a response to encounters with religionists from established traditions (2002, 88-89).



Sukezō being the most prominent. Since the Twelve Songs that were written in 1867 make mention of the *ōgi no sazukeye*, it is assumed that it was still practiced at least two years after the Sukezō jiken. The Tenrikyō perspective on the banning of the *ōgi no sazukeye* is that “God’s will was not conveyed as it should have been; some egotistic, personal interpretations were mixed” in the invocation (Nakayama Shōzen 1986, 20).

### **Tenrikyō under the sanction of Yoshida Shintō**

The Fudōin monks’ complaint to the Furuichi Magistrate resulted in an investigation that found nothing wrong with Miki’s activities other than the lack of official sanction. The Magistrate’s office suggested to Miki’s group that they take the steps to obtain legal status. Opposition from the Fudōin would not soon abate, however, and the yamabushi continued to violate the Residence. The situation became so serious that villagers, tired and angered by the escalating violence, armed themselves with clubs and hoes to block the monks’ entry into Shōyashiki (Takano 2001, 158). A concerned Shūji attempted to settle the situation and visited to inquire after the assistance of Nishihata Kishirō, the village head of Kobayashi that neighbored the Fudōin in Koizumi. Once the monks learned of this, they surrounded Nishihata’s residence and threatened to drag Shūji out and kill him. Nishihata, who was responsible for Shūji’s well-being, succeeded in having yamabushi Morimoto Shingorō appease the rage of his colleagues (*ibid.* 159). The threats did not end until the Nara Magistrate Office intervened with an investigation and subsequently imprisoned a number of Fudōin monks.

The disturbances from the Fudōin and continued opposition from nearby shrines and temples persuaded Shūji to take the necessary steps toward establishing legal sanction for Miki's movement with assistance from Moriya Chikuzen under the Yoshida Shintō Administrative Office in Kyoto. To obtain legal sanction, letters of recommendation were required from Moriya, from the feudal lord of the Tōdō clan that ruled Shōyashiki, and from the Furuichi Magistrate Office. On top of the invaluable assistance from Moriya, Shūji also received help from Yamazawa Ryōsuke and Adachi Terunojō, who worked at the Furuichi Magistrate Office (*ibid.* 161). Adachi is also known to have been saved from blackpox by Miki's prayers when he was an infant in her care. With the efforts from these three individuals, in July 1867 Shūji received a license from the Yoshida house in Kyoto to allow followers to worship at the Residence and to conduct prayers to Tenrin-Ō-Myōjin (KTK 100). It is assumed that Shūji received training in the rituals and doctrines of Yoshida Shintō at this time. Yoshida officials also told Shūji that he no longer had to endure any obstructions from shugenja and other Buddhist priests, and was encouraged to hold them off with guns if necessary (Moroi 64-65). Helen Hardacre has noted that "founders of new religious movements such as Kurozumikyō and Konkōkyō sought licenses as a means of escaping suppression" and such licenses also "represented a safeguard against the inclination of local officials to persecute religious activity as heterodox" (2002, 54).

Shūji and the followers were overjoyed at obtaining legal status. However, Miki remained unimpressed as these legal measures went against her will (Takano 2001, 163). Miki kept saying that "The daimyō, together with their guards armed with spears and their palanquin bearers will be abolished" (Moroi 66) and predicted the downfall of Yoshida Shintō: "True, the Yoshida clan is

apparently great. But in fact it is no more than one of the branches of a tree. The time will come when it will wither" (LO 74).

### **The impact of Meiji government policy on Shugendō and Tenrikyō**

With the fall of the Tokugawa Bakufu in 1868, the Meiji coalition extended its authority and introduced a number of policies that impacted the course of Tenrikyō's development and eventually proved disastrous for the fortunes of Shugendō and forced much of its practices underground. The first of these policies was the forced 'disassociation' of Shintō from Buddhism (*shinbutsu bunri* 神仏分離). This separationist policy led to the movement known as *haibutsu kishaku* (suppression of Buddhism) that was particularly severe in Yamato and has been described by Allan Grapard as "Japan's ignored cultural revolution" (240). Priests from Kōfukuji, Tōdaiji, and Tōnomine were forced to leave the priesthood. "Attached temples to Isonokami Shrine, Ōmiwa Shrine, and Ōyamato Shrine were abolished with many other temples. Especially the extinction of Uchiyama-Eikyūji Temple, the main temple attached to Isonokami Shrine must have been a shocking event to the neighboring villages to tell the coming of the new era" (Hayasaka 1987, 16).

In 1872, avatar (*gongen*) worship and Shugendō groups were outlawed. It may have not been a complete coincidence that the Nara Kongōin was destroyed in the very same year. In the following year, traditional Shugendō ritualistic practices that involved miko and *yorigitō* (prayers of possession) were also proscribed (Miyake 1996, 172). Shugendō temples during this time were forced to join Shingon and Tendai denominations to survive and also saw an exodus of priests who were either laicized or exchanged their Buddhist robes for Shintō

garments. Those who chose to be absorbed within Shingon and Tendai priesthoods found themselves restricted from positions of any considerable authority (Jaffe 154-155; Sekimori 211).

Tenrikyō was essentially vulnerable to official suppression after the abolishment of the Yoshida Shintō Administrative Office in 1870, which effectively revoked their legal status. While her followers were in awe as they remembered Miki's prediction several years before, they were disappointed to lose the sanction they attained. Though Tenrikyō was an illegal religious movement from 1870, things remained relatively quiet for a number of years. The persecution of Tenrikyō by prefectural authorities did not begin until 1874, following the creation of the Great Promulgation Campaign (*taikyō senpu undō*) through the Daikyōin system.<sup>38</sup> Shūji became the village head of Shōyashiki in 1873 and "[b]ecause Shūji was the village head, the Nakayama family's residence was offered as the venue for preaching the Shintō nationalization program" (Hatakama 2002, 92).

However, the ideology of State Shintō was incompatible with Miki's vision and she soon openly challenged local Shintō priests over the legitimacy of the new Meiji government. In the tenth lunar month of 1874, Miki sent two of her disciples, Nakata Gisaburō and Matsuo Ichibei to inquire about the kami enshrined at Ōyamato Jinja.<sup>39</sup>

---

<sup>38</sup> Refer to Hardacre (1986b; 1989) for a scholarly account on the Great Promulgation Campaign.

<sup>39</sup> This action cannot be unrelated to the fact that the Ōyamato Jinja was made into the local Shōkyōin for the promulgation of State Shintō (Murakami 1989). On June 23, 1874, Koike Hirosuke, an official of Nara Prefecture, attended an enshrinement ceremony at Ōyamato as an imperial representative. At this ceremony the imperial regalia were enshrined, with each piece of the three regalia symbolizing a different kami among the imperial pantheon (Hayasaka 1987, 18-19). Murakami Shigeyoshi has suggested that the government's usurpation of Ōyamato Jinja for the purpose of State Shintō shocked the populace who had long worshiped there (1989, 17). Miki herself could also have been deeply concerned since the Ōyamato Shrine was not only her natal family tutelary shrine, but women of the Nagao clan (Miki's mother's natal family) long served as miko of the shrine (Takano 2001, 22). Miki used the recent events as an opportunity to have two of her followers confront the priests of the shrine.

The priests of Ōyamato Jinja responded that the shrine was dedicated to kami from the *Nihongi* and the *Kojiki*. Nakata and Matsuo further asked questions concerning the types of blessings and protections that were bestowed by these kami, and the priests were at a loss as to how to answer. The silence of the priests encouraged Nakata and Matsuo to articulate that their kami Tenri-Ō-no-Mikoto, was *moto no kami, jitsu no kami*—the true and original kami—and showed them parts three and four of the *Ofudesaki*. Realizing that Nakata and Matsuo were followers of Miki, the priests mocked them and suggested it would be best for them to concentrate on farming. Then one of the priests retorted,

To assume the name of a god not found anywhere in the ancient chronicles is inexcusable and liable to censure. The Isonokami Shrine itself is not exempt from censure, for it has allowed its own parishioners to advocate such a heresy (*isetsu* 異説) due to its inadequate supervision. At any rate, I give you fair warning that we shall visit your place one of these days (LO 87).

This incident led to the start of the state's scrutiny and persecution against Miki's nascent movement. The state found a number of reasons to view Tenrikyō with disdain. One reason stemmed from the Meiji government's drive toward 'civilization and enlightenment' (*bunmei kaika* 文明開化) through "the importation of Western knowledge and culture" (Hardacre 1989, 44). This ideal proved to be a source of conflict for Tenrikyō and other emerging religious movements since "[t]o intellectuals these groups seemed reactionary and antimodern because of their frequently unsophisticated doctrine and pervasive faith healing and because they often appeared to contain more superstition than religion" (*ibid.* 126). Secondly, the *Doroumi Kōki* cosmogony that Miki propounded not only sharply contrasted from the accepted canon of State Shintō

but also blatantly associated Shintō kami with Buddhist deities and historical figures.<sup>40</sup>

Beginning in 1876, it was “prohibited for the populace to pray in personal shrines and temples where services are conducted by individuals in their personal homes” (Hayasaka 1984, 90). In June 1876, Imai Sukezō,<sup>41</sup> who had since resumed his religious activities, was arrested and detained for chanting the name of a kami without official recognition, for using his home as a sanctuary of worship, and for promoting a dubious (i.e., heretical) doctrine (*kaisetsu* 怪説). Sukezō was sentenced to seventy lashings as punishment for his ‘indiscretions’ (TJ 463).<sup>42</sup>

In order to avoid similar persecution, Shūji obtained a license from Sakai Prefecture that year to run a steam bath and inn as a way to circumvent the law and allow people to assemble at the Residence. Miki expressed disdain at the measure, warning Shūji “God the Parent will withdraw along the way,” (LO 101) which meant he was defying God’s will and risking his life.

In 1880 Shūji made efforts to once again obtain legal status as a religious organization, this time under a Buddhist temple. Again, Miki declared, “If you do such a thing, God the Parent will withdraw” (*ibid.* 110). Disregarding the

---

<sup>40</sup> By presenting Izanagi and Izanami as the parents of human beings, Tenrikyō’s cosmogony was, by implication, denying the divinity of Amaterasu and the emperor. By no means was Tenrikyō alone taking this position, as Konkōkyō was even more explicit in this regard (Katsurajima 38).

<sup>41</sup> Whose legal name was now Imai Shinjirō as a result of a 1870 decree that required commoners with given names containing the appellations *suke*, (*y*)*emon*, *jō*, and *kami* to change their names. Others associated with Tenrikyō who were affected by this policy include Shūji (originally Nakayama Zenyemon); Nakayama Shinnosuke (whose legal name became Shinjirō); Yamazawa Ryōsuke (who was renamed Ryōjirō); Tsuji Chūsaku (originally Chūyemon); Adachi Terunojō (was renamed Genshirō); and Nakata Gisaburō (originally Sayemon) (Takano 2001, 210). The introduction of this policy requires anyone studying the Bakumatsu-Meiji time periods to be aware of the name changes of particular individuals. While Tenrikyō today is mostly consistent about using one name over the other, there does not seem to be any clear criteria to explain why the pre-1870 name is favored in some cases and the post-1870 names are predominant in the other cases.

<sup>42</sup> In 1889 Sukezō attained legal sanction with Ontakekyō headquarters to establish his movement as the Tenrin Kōsha Jimusho (TJ 463).

warning, Shūji brought Miki's movement under the jurisdiction of a former Shugendō temple, the Kongōzan Jifukuji 金剛山地福寺. The Tenrin-Ō-Kōsha was inaugurated on September 22 with a goma ritual. Shūji, as the vice head (*fukushachō*) of the religious association, received ritual implements such as lanterns and a mandala of Tenrin-Ō. The establishment of the Tenrin-Ō-Kōsha led the faithful to compile a list of Tenrikyō religious associations, which added up to 1,442 members under seventeen *kō*.

Despite of Shūji's endeavors, the establishment of the Tenrin-Ō-Kōsha failed to fully provide protection from official persecution. Villagers voiced protests that their homes were constantly used by friends and relatives who visited the Residence.<sup>43</sup> The police viewed the followers' worship and 'kagura' dance as a violation of the proscribed mixing of Shintō and Buddhism (Okuya 308). The most notable event that revealed the inefficacy of the sanction received through the Jifukuji was the confiscation of two tiers of the stone Kanrodai in May 1882. The prefectural authorities at this time wrote the Kanrodai tiers and Miki's red kimono "were detained as the articles used as the tools of the crime of seducing the public by prayers and charms of sorcery" (quoted in Hayasaka 1987, 28).

Miki's warnings to Shūji became reality a year later, as he died in April 1881, leaving his widow Matsue in charge of the Tenrin-Ō-Kōsha.<sup>44</sup> Matsue

---

<sup>43</sup> Among the complaints that were voiced against Tenrikyō by the villagers were, "If our relatives visit Tenrikyō we must house them and when it rains, we must lend them umbrellas. Why, even our children waste money, when a row of stalls are arranged on festival days on the street. So the officials must suppress them or they must pay for our loss" (Nakayama Shōzen 1964, 145).

<sup>44</sup> *The Life of Oyasama* explains Shūji's intentions establishing the Tenrin-Ō-Kōsha as follows: "Shūji knew well that such a plan could not possibly be acceptable to God. But compared with the arrest and imprisonment of Oyasama, his life meant nothing to him. He felt compelled to take whatever measures he could for the safety of Oyasama and those who gathered at the Residence" (LO 110).

herself died in September 1882, and the Jifukuji subsequently canceled their sanction given to the Tenrin-Ō-Kōsha in December of that year. While they no longer enjoyed their expedient association with a branch Shingon temple, the kō religious associations would still continue to operate, albeit illegally.

In 1884, the local police detained Miki during the lunar calendar days of the twenty-fifth, twenty-sixth, and twenty-seventh for three consecutive months to discourage followers from gathering to perform the Tsutome. Miki's continual detainments heightened the determination of the faithful to protect her by securing government sanction from various prefectural offices.<sup>45</sup> Kō in Kyoto and Osaka were successful in avoiding persecution by donning the appearance of Shingaku associations, and Shingaku groups enjoyed the support from authorities of Kyoto Prefecture (Takano 2001, 424). Followers in Awa (Tokushima) had similarly attained legal status with the Shintō Shūsei-ha (KTK 278-279).

Others attempted to take the existing Shingaku associations and form a national organization called the Dai Nippon Tenrin Kyōkai. In March 1885 a meeting was held with a number of leading followers such as Nakayama Shinnosuke, Shimizu Yonosuke, and Izutsu Umejirō at the house of Murata Chōbei (who placed the sign "Church Establishment Office" at his entrance). As those in attendance argued over a proposal to decide the kaichō and directors of the organization by ballot, Izutsu was attacked by severe stomach pains. When the followers were motivated to ask Miki about the sudden illness, she replied, "Sah, sah, indeed the Shinbashira is thin at present. But when the flesh is added

---

<sup>45</sup> The fact that the government frequently shifted the former province of Yamato under the supervision of different prefectural offices certainly did not help the efforts of Miki's followers. Yamato Province became Nara Prefecture in 1871, which was dissolved and added to Sakai Prefecture in April 1876. Sakai merged with Osaka Prefecture in 1881, and Yamato was under Osaka Prefecture until Nara Prefecture was reestablished in December 1887 (TOD 46).



to him, no one knows how great he will become" (LO 201). With this statement Miki reminded her followers it was against the will of the kami to even consider a Tenrikyō organization without Shinnosuke as its leader. Miki had placed much of her expectations on Shinnosuke, who was adopted into the Nakayama family in 1881 and named the legal successor of the family the next year.<sup>46</sup>

Miki continued to insist that the followers ought to concentrate on the performance of the Tsutome and warned them about becoming distracted with obtaining legal recognition saying, "there is no reason for the parent to obtain permission from her children" (TJ 320). This persuaded the majority at the meeting to drop the plans concerning the formation of the Dai Nippon Tenrin Kyōkai. There is also reason to believe these plans were against Miki's wishes since the proposed petitions lacked any mention of her teachings or of the worship of Tenri-Ō-no-Mikoto and was basically slanted toward the ideology promoted by the Great Promulgation Campaign (Hayasaka 1987, 29).

Still, efforts to establish a Tenrikyō organization continued, this time with Shinnosuke at the helm. Shinnosuke and ten others applied for positions as instructors (*kyōdōshoku*)<sup>47</sup> of the Shintō Honkyoku. Shinnosuke was assigned as an instructor on May 22, 1885. On May 23, Shinnosuke further received permission to establish a sixth-rank church under the direct supervision of the

---

<sup>46</sup> Miki's grandson Nakayama Shinnosuke, the first Shinbashira (patriarch) of the future Tenrikyō organization was born the third son of Kajimoto Sōjirō and Haru in 1866. According to Tenrikyō sources, Miki made clear of her wish to adopt him into the Nakayama family from the very beginning and establish him as the first Shinbashira. During Haru's pregnancy, Miki declared, "This time I put the soul of Father Maegawa in Oharu. The child to be called Shinnosuke is destined to be the Shinbashira" (LO 53).

<sup>47</sup> Hardacre (1986b; 1989) and Jaffe respectively translate the term *kyōdōshoku* as "(national) evangelists" and "doctrinal instructors," to refer to the religious instructors who came from the ranks of both Shintō and Buddhist priesthoods to take part in the Great Promulgation Campaign. By 1885, however, the Great Promulgation Campaign was abolished following the withdrawal of the Higashi and Nishi Honganji in 1884, so the term *kyōdōshoku* as it appears here refer to certified religious instructors of a Kyōha Shintō sect. The ranking system for instructors of the Great Promulgation Campaign was also largely adopted intact by Kyōha Shintō. The term *kyōdōshoku* continued to be used by the Tenrikyō organization until the *Fukugen* (restoration) movement enacted after World War II (TJ 286).

Shintō Honkyoku. However, this never became more than a ceremonial and unofficial sanction. Though a petition was made to Osaka Prefecture with these new qualifications, it was eventually rejected by the governor's office. The followers' attempts to gain the legal sanction would not come to fruition until the year after Miki's death in 1887.

### Chapter conclusion

Tenrikyō emerged in an increasingly hostile social environment. Nakayama Miki frequently experienced tension, conflict, and confrontation in her life as she challenged the social conventions of her day. Her family resisted her demands to fall into the very depths of poverty. Relatives and fellow villagers treated her as an outcast. As her religious activities began to pick up, local Shugendō priests displayed their opposition against her unauthorized religious activities, occasionally with violence. Miki's healings and assurances of safe childbirth represented an encroachment into Tōzan Shugendō's traditional market of providing practical benefits (*genze riyaku*) to the farming populace in Yamato. In order to protect their economic base, Kongōin yamabushi confronted Miki and when this failed, attempted to nurture Sukezō as Miki's rival.

My emphasis on the involvement of the Koizumi Fudōin and Nara Kongōin in the Sukezō incident may falsely characterize Sukezō as a passive pawn in the affair. I may have failed to account how Sukezō could have been well aware of Shugendō's ambivalence toward Miki's entry into the religious market and that he actively sought legal authority with the patronage of Shugendō. In fact, at least two theologians suggest there was a dialogue between Sukezō and the Kongōin to establish a new religious movement (Nakayama Y.

1986, 79; Serizawa 1983, 147). However, despite the inconclusiveness of the supporting evidence, the arrival of the monk from the Kongōin instead of the Fudōin suggests to me that Sukezō was ultimately subject to the whims of the patrons that gave him support.

The Sukezō jiken illustrates a power struggle between invested parties over securing ritualistic rights over the rising prominence of Miki's guardian kami Tenri-Ō-no-Mikoto in Yamato Province in the late Tokugawa period. Given the origins of Miki's initial kamigakari through a yose-kaji rite gone awry from the presiding yamabushi's perspective, Sukezō's challenge was an attempt by Shugendō to take back Miki's kami Tenri-Ō-no-Mikoto and secure its worship under their direct supervision.

I have suggested that the Sukezō heresy was an attempt by an established Shugendō temple, namely the Fudōin, to secure the worship of Tenri-Ō-no-Mikoto under its sponsorship. The involvement of the Fudōin in the Sukezō jiken brings a completely new light on Tenrikyō's future confrontations with the Fudōin. The Sukezō jiken is a part of a series of confrontations Tenrikyō had with Shugendō that cumulated with the Fudōin disturbances that led Miki to first compose the first section of the *Mikagura-uta*, Tenrikyō's central liturgical text. Helen Hardacre's insights into the sources of contention behind the interreligious conflict between Shugendō and the new religions can also be applied not only to Tenrikyō's experience with non-Shugendō Buddhist monks but with Sukezō's transgression as well. The Sukezō jiken reflects the tension that existed between Miki's movement and religions that enjoyed official recognition. The incident also portrays the rivalry between Yoshida Shintō and Shugendō in north Yamato. Moriya Chikuzen's indirect support to Miki by

sending his relative Yamazawa Ryōsuke as his representative has been regarded an action related to his activities to suppress Buddhism (Hatakama 1991a, 131).

Although Tenrikyō currently regards the Sukezō jiken as the first heretical incident in its history, it is far from certain whether Miki actually regarded Sukezō's honji suijaku doctrine as a 'heresy.' If we consider Miki strongly reacted against any action that potentially undermined the absolute power of her kami Tenri-Ō-no-Mikoto, the incident may instead represent another example of her constant refusal to submit to traditional authority. As related in this chapter, Miki was opposed to Shūji's efforts to gain legal sanction under Yoshida Shintō and a local Shingon temple. Aochi Shin writes:

Miki's son Shūji created the Tenrin-Ō-Kōsha in 1880 under the subservience of the Kongōzan Jifukuji. Displeased, Miki broke the ties with the Jifukuji in 1882. There was no way Miki would allow the supreme kami of the universe, Tenri-Ō-no-Mikoto to submit to the deities of another religious sect (1970, 203).

Finally, just to speculate on the source of Sukezō's *honji suijaku* argument there seems to be a theoretical basis to call the Jiba the *suijiaku* of Tenri-Ō-no-Mikoto. Kuroda Toshio has related that in the medieval period, the term *suijaku* has been popularly viewed as a concrete phenomenon, quite unlike the classical meaning as the "manifest traces" of a Buddha.

The term *suijaku* literally meant to *descend from heaven to a given spot and to become the local guardian kami of that spot* (emphasis mine). Hence, at that spot there would arise a legend of the mysterious relationship between men and kami, and the very area enshrining the kami would be looked upon as sacred ground where profound doctrinal principles lay concealed. The history of this manifestation—that is, its development over time—was related in the form of an *engi* (a historical narrative), and the positioning of its enshrinement—that is, its location in space—was depicted in a form of a mandala (Kuroda, 14-15).

Though there is no evidence to suggest that Miki and her followers conceptualized the Jiba according to this medieval understanding, her initial kamigakari can be seen as an engi narrative of the Jiba. The cosmogony *Doroumi Kōki* can then be understood as a myth that legitimized and established a deeper significance to the founding of Tenrikyō.

The religious environment of the Meiji period would grow ever more hostile toward Tenrikyō as the Great Promulgation Campaign was put into effect through the Daikyōin. As the Tenrikyō congregation grew, it was increasingly viewed as a form of heresy by local Chūkyōin officials. While Shinnosuke was able to secure civil authorization from Tokyo Prefecture to establish the Tenrikyō organization under the Shintō Honkyoku in 1888, a year after Miki's death, government oppression would continue to be a factor during the emergence of the schism today known as Daidōkyō in 1897.

— Chapter Two —  
Heresy During the Watch of Honseki Iburi Izō:  
The Mizu-yashiki Jiken

Following Nakayama Miki's death in 1887, her disciple Iburi Izō remained the only member of her following who clearly possessed the characteristics of a prophet until Iida Iwajirō—the founder of both the Tenrikyō Heian Shikyōkai (presently a *daikyōkai*, or grand church) and the schism Daidōkyō—asserted to have received divine revelations in 1897. Toward the end of Miki's lifetime, Izō often instructed followers in her place. Beginning in 1880, Miki began sending followers with worldly concerns to Izō for instructions, saying "Of matters concerning dust, go to the workplace (*shigoto-ba*)" (TJ 361). From 1882, with increasing frequency, Miki told her followers, "Go and ask Izō-san" about various matters (TJ 55-56), essentially giving Izō a position second only to hers.

On the other hand, there were several factors that made Iwajirō a unique case among his Tenrikyō peers. First, Iwajirō joined the faith as a child along with his family at least five full months before Izō in late 1863. Second, Iwajirō received from Miki the *mizu no sazukeye*, a charismatic transmission that gave him the power to heal, when he was only six years old, which has been noted to be an exception among exceptions (Toyoshima 131). It would be unthinkable today for someone to receive the Sazuke at such a young age since a Tenrikyō follower currently must be over the age of seventeen to attend the Besseki lectures. The transmission of Miki's charismatic power to Iwajirō occurred at a time long before the procedure of distributing the Sazuke was routinized and Iwajirō received his Sazuke transmission at Ando Village, the only individual who could claim to have received such a transmission outside of Shōyashiki during Miki's lifetime. Lastly, Iwajirō's case was also exceptional in that he was a head

minister of a Tenrikyō branch church who had received his Sazuke directly from Miki when the overwhelming majority had received the transmission from Izō.<sup>48</sup>

The Mizu-yashiki jiken (the Residence of Water Incident) essentially represented a clash between two prophets and their competing theological claims. Details of the incident vary among Tenrikyō and Daidōkyō sources. A recent church history of Heian Daikyōkai describes the situation as follows:

In early January 1896, without any warning or prior discussion, Rev. Iida informed his congregation that there would be a special announcement (*shikomi*) to be delivered to all branch church officials (*yaku-in*) and followers on September 15. On that day Rev. Iida proclaimed the following to everyone in attendance:

“The revelation of heaven has made it clear that the *mizu no sazu* bestowed by Nakayama Miki of Tenrikyō was not given [to me], a person, but that it was bestowed upon my residence. The preordained time has arrived to establish this residence as the *Mizu-yashiki* according to heaven’s decree. The kami have spoken: water shall be distinguished from fire. Tenrikyō headquarters is in Shōyashiki, the residence and source of fire (*hi no moto Shōyashiki*); this residence is the *Mizu-yashiki*. Water is the original parent (*moto no oya*), while fire is a protection that comes second. This residence is the original residence of the world’s creation. From now, the kami shall distinguish the world accordingly under [their] protection.”

Though there were church officials who already foresaw the sudden announcement, the majority of officials including Matsuo Yozō were stunned. The officials gathered to the side and held a conference. With the exception of Yozō, all the officials felt they ought to maintain their loyalty with Rev. Iida as [they felt] there was no mistaking the blessings of the *mizu no sazu* they witnessed until that day. Yozō then countered, “We are all members of Tenrikyō. Let us hold another conference after asking Honseki-sama [i.e., Iburī Izō] of this matter and wait for his instructions (*Osashizu*). I resolve to be at the vanguard in following Rev. Iida if Honseki-sama also states this is the *Mizu-yashiki*,” and no one expressed their opposition.

---

<sup>48</sup> In my research, I have found only two other branch church founders who received a Sazuke transmission from Nakayama Miki: Izumita Tōkichi of Nakatsu and Hirano Tatsujirō of Sakai.

Yozō immediately headed to Jiba and reported the situation to the Shinbashira. (The oral tradition of Heian maintains that) upon making a prompt petition to the Honseki, [Yozō] received the following instruction:

Sah, sah, the matter you inquire of, the Sazuke was bestowed upon the person, not upon the residence. Sah, sah, hasten to convey this truth; be sure to settle the matter at once.

Yozō returned to the church, presented the instruction and urged [Rev. Iida] to correct his mistaken views. Burning with rage, Rev. Iida tore up the paper on which the instruction was written into shreds and handed down Yozō's excommunication (TJKH 562).

The official history of Heian Daikyōkai presented above attempts to show how Iida Iwajirō skillfully utilized components of the Tenrikyō worldview to establish the doctrinal authority of his residence over the Jiba. First, Iwajirō's statement that the kami would distinguish (*uchiwakeru*) between water and fire echoes a verse from the *Ofudesaki* (Of VI: 6). Also, in the Tenrikyō pantheon of kami (*tohashira no kami*), the divine name of Kunitokotachi-no-Mikoto, the kami that provides the blessing of water is called *moto no oya* in Yamazawa Ryōsuke's version of the Tenrikyō cosmogony (DK verse 3). Further, Iwajirō takes advantage of the ambiguity of the kana in the scripture *Mikagura-uta* to designate Tenrikyō as the 'Residence of Fire' (*hi no moto Shōyashiki* 火の元庄屋敷; MKU III: 1; XI: 1) when the traditional Tenrikyō interpretation of this phrase means "home of the sun in Shōyashiki Village" (日の本 庄屋敷) (Fukaya 1995, 83).

However, there are elements in the Heian Daikyōkai account whose historical veracity is highly suspect, as they contradict information recorded in one of Tenrikyō's own scriptures, the *Osashizu*. Information in the *Osashizu* that contradicts the Heian account include details over Iwajirō's patron kami



(identified in the *Osashizu* as Tsukiyomi instead of Kunitokotachi-no-Mikoto) and Matsuo Yozō's so-called excommunication. According to the *Osashizu*, Matsuo participated in attempts to convince leaders at Tenrikyō headquarters of the authenticity of Iwajirō's revelations as late as August 1897, which casts doubt on the account of Iwajirō tearing up Izō's instructions. On top of these factors, the entire account can be called into question when one takes into consideration that Matsuo eventually replaced Iwajirō as the head minister of Heian.

Current Tenrikyō histories maintain that Iwajirō proclaimed the superiority of his residence, the Mizu-yashiki, over the Jiba, "the Residence of Fire," was as absolute as the natural phenomenon of water extinguishing fire, which clearly represented a heretical claim. Yet Ichise Kōzō and Ichise Hatsuko, compilers of a biography on Iida Iwajirō, have argued that Iwajirō neither made the claim that his residence was the original residence described in Tenrikyō's cosmogony nor did he ever refer to the Jiba as the "Residence of Fire" in his writings. They insist that this account was a later fabrication circulated after Iburi Izō's death.<sup>49</sup> It is reasonable to conclude that the historical record was rewritten to present the central doctrinal issue between the two charismatics as a dispute over sacred place—conforming to a nonnegotiable tenet in Tenrikyō's self-defined theology. Although it is impossible to completely bridge the discrepancy between present Tenrikyō and Daidōkyō accounts of the Mizu-yashiki jiken, it appears that for Iwajirō, the main issue at stake was not the authority of sacred place, but the proper object of worship to be installed at Tenrikyō churches. According to Iwajirō's revelations he received from the late Nakayama Miki, the kami vehemently disagreed with the decision by Tenrikyō

---

<sup>49</sup> Ichise Kōzō and Hatsuko, *Iida Iwajirō go-denki* as cited in Toyoshima (142). I was unable to acquire or gain access to the original work.

headquarters to replace the *mamori-fuda* 守札 (talismans inscribed with the divine name 'Tenri-Ō-no-Mikoto') that were banned by the Home Ministry in 1896 with sacred mirrors. Through his revelations, Iwajirō argued that the proper object of worship (*shintai*) was to be a paper sword that symbolized the cutting of evil karma (Toyoshima 139). Iwajirō demanded the sword had to be adopted as the *shintai*, otherwise, Tenrikyō headquarters risked bringing displeasure to the kami, who would abandon the Jiba to open the true path of salvation from the Mizu-yashiki (*ibid.* 141).

Compared to the relatively unregulated religious environment of the late Tokugawa period in which the Sukezō jiken occurred, the Mizu-yashiki jiken emerged while government persecution was at a climax. Tenrikyō's exponential growth in the ten years after Miki's death made it a perceived threat that would invite nationwide oppression by the state. The intense manner Tenrikyō missionaries employed in their propagation efforts caused the public to view the upstart religion with great trepidation. The Home Ministry attempted to counter this development by issuing a directive to force a revision of its doctrine and ritual procedures. Tenrikyō's charismatic guide, Iburi Izō, advised the church leadership to accede to state demands until the tide of the oppression ebbed. Iwajirō's new revelations that claimed the late founder Miki rejected the use of sacred mirrors as objects of worship potentially left Tenrikyō vulnerable to state persecution, which led to his ouster and that of his followers from the Tenrikyō institution. Before presenting the Secret Directives and their aftermath with the Mizu-yashiki incident, I will briefly describe the chain of events that led to them. As Iburi Izō succeeded Miki as the charismatic leader of Tenrikyō, he attempted to consolidate the authority of Miki's designated sacred space over its branch churches by establishing Tenrikyō church headquarters in Shōyashiki.

**Miki's 'withdrawal from physical life':  
the passing of the charismatic mantle to Iburi Izō**

Miki's urgings to her followers to perform the Tsutome came to a climax in January 1887. From this time, Miki increasingly spent more of her time in bed. A long detainment in prison during the previous winter seemed to be taking its toll. The fact that Nakata Gisaburō, who was detained with her, died in June 1886 only gave followers more reason to be concerned.

By this time, Iburi Izō, based on the Invocation of Speech (*gonjō no ukagai*) he received from Miki in 1875 (TJ 361), also had the ability to communicate with the kami. Izō had gained Miki's utmost trust in his efforts building the Tsutome-basho after the first incident at Ōyamato Jinja that discouraged the majority of the followers from continuing the faith, and he was responsible for instructing adherents since 1880.<sup>50</sup>

The followers inquired Izō regarding Miki's illness and he similarly conveyed demands that the Tsutome be performed. Yet Miki's followers were hesitant to carry this out, as they were afraid it would attract the attention of the local police. When Miki was able to make a momentary recovery, one of her more urgent directions was as follows:

I instructed you to do it immediately. Sah, now, at this time, I am in haste. Some of you say, "Respond to God's will at once." Others say, "Be prudent." Still others say, "Wait awhile." Sah, sah, concerning the one thing, do you fear the law, the law? Do you fear God or do you fear the law? It is useless to hesitate.

---

<sup>50</sup> Concerning the bestowing of the *gonjō no yurushi* to Izō, in the *Ofudesaki*, it is written, "I desire that the two persons received as shrines by Tsuki-Hi each be given a separate room. Then, in whatever you pray, your salvation will be assured. Watch closely!" (Of IX: 5-6). Izō subsequently moved into the Residence with his wife and children in 1881.

The Service must be performed at any cost. I have told you this many times before. I am not instructing you in something new at this time. Which path will you take? Do not ask Me such a question. You should understand by this one instruction (LO 236).

Miki's illness was perceived as her way to test the resolve of the faithful to perform the Tsutome at all costs. Though these demands were met with hesitancy, Shinnosuke asked for time so the followers could practice the hand movements of the ritual. Miki's condition initially improved but deteriorated once again. As the followers were pressed by the urgency of the situation, they performed the Tsutome, hoping it would allow her to recover. Instead, as soon as the last refrain of the last Song was sung, Nakayama Miki, who was listening with joy to the sounds of the *Mikagura-uta*, breathed her last on twenty-sixth day of the first lunar month. Presently Tenrikyō's euphemism for Miki's death states that she 'withdrew from physical life' (*utsushimi o kakusareta*).<sup>51</sup> She was ninety years old.

Once the devastated followers were able to gather their composure, they went to Izō who said,

Because of My love for you, My children, the Parent shortened Her life by twenty-five years to step out and save the world from now. Observe well. Observe well what the path has been and what the path will become... Sah, there was a thing I intended to give My children but I was not able. I shall bestow this truth [i.e., the Sazuke] on you step by step hereafter. Remember this well (LO 240).

Izō's explanation here that Miki cut short her life by twenty-five years so her "children" could perform the Tsutome without worrying about the police

---

<sup>51</sup> There was a time when Miki's passing was variously known as *tenshō* 天昇 ('the Ascension') and *gokiyū* 御帰幽 (akin to 'departing of the spirit').

coming to arrest her further emphasized the central importance of the ritual. Izō also informed followers that Miki in the meantime would continue to lead the movement without a physical body, which established the fundamental Tenrikyō doctrine of the 'everliving' Foundress (*go-zonmei no Oyasama*). In the above announcement Izō also promised to the members he would continue to bestow the Sazuke in her place and that they could continue to communicate with Miki through his mediation.

However, Izō's succession as the charismatic leader of the Tenrikyō organization was still not complete. Not long after Miki's passing, Izō became seriously ill and experienced a fever during which his perspiration formed sticky threads. His ribs on the right side of his body then broke one after another; the same then occurred on the left side of his body. Izō's daughter Yoshie later quoted what Izō described as follows: "Then, the ribs clicked one by one and were restored to their original state. The whole time the pain was indescribable" (TOMD 1998, 15).

Izō subsequently gave a series of divine directions ('timely talks') and the matter of Izō becoming the Honseki was brought up in the discussions. Though God the Parent related to those listening "I shall not compel you to accept," the followers acceded and Nakayama Shinnosuke took on the responsibility of looking after Izō's wife and children (Os 1: 31-32, Meiji 20 [1887] March 25; TOMD 1990, 17-18). From that day onward, Izō was recognized as the Honseki, the occasional medium for communication with Miki and Tenri-Ō-no-Mikoto.<sup>52</sup>

Although it has been described that Izō "proved to be a devoted and entirely efficient and shrewd organiser" (Blacker 1971, 577), in actuality it was

---

<sup>52</sup> The Honseki refers to Izō's "position of revealing divine directions and bestowing the Sazuke" (TOMD 1990, 18). The term is also used to refer to the seat from which a person receives the Sazuke (TJ 814).

Shinnosuke and other leading followers who looked after the administration of the new Tenrikyō institution. For the most part Izō entrusted them with making their own decisions regarding most aspects in running the organization. Izō only felt obligated to step in to approve these decisions, provide appropriate spiritual guidance, and notify the ecclesia whenever he felt they had breached one of Miki's established tenets. "Izō's role was confined to correcting their decisions from the spiritual viewpoint. 'The doctrine of the Foundress's further life' (*zonmei no ri*) and this limitation of Izō's power are closely related to each other" (Shimazono 1986, 61). Shinnosuke and Izō highly depended upon one another as neither could begin to replace Miki's role to the faithful. Nevertheless, as Tenrikyō grew into a massive religious organization, Shinnosuke served as Tenrikyō's main temporal representative and Izō provided unmatched legitimacy to the institution whenever he entered a kamigakari state to give his approval of administrative decisions.

### **Tenrikyō orthodoxy under Iburi Izō and the concept of the Jiba in the *Osashizu***

Under Izō's spiritual leadership, the nascent Tenrikyō movement consolidated its multitude of kō that were scattered across a number of prefectures under a centralized authoritative body. Izō then subsequently permitted or ordered the temporal leadership to enact a number of measures that helped institutionalize the growing organization. First, Tenrikyō gained recognition as a legal religious organization under the Shintō Honkyoku. While he gave his conditional approval to establish Tenrikyō headquarters originally in Tokyo, Izō was quick to remind followers the only place the headquarters could be situated was at the sacred locale of the Jiba. Izō hastened Shinnosuke and

other Tenrikyō *kyōdōshoku* (religious instructors recognized by the Shintō Honkyoku) to make the petition to relocate the headquarters to Jiba. Second, Izō then allowed kō to reorganize themselves into branch churches only after the Jiba could be officially 'settled' as the Tenrikyō headquarters following its inauguration ceremony. Finally, Izō explicitly denied these branch churches from performing the Kagura Zutome and limited the performance of the soteriological rite at the Jiba.

In early 1888, followers quietly made preparations for the first *nensai* (death anniversary) for Nakayama Miki. They began the ceremonies by performing the Kagura Zutome and the Teodori from five in the morning. Just as they were about to begin the Shintō-style memorial service (*saishiki*), a priest from Ōmiwa Kyōkai came and demanded why they had conducted the ceremony without his knowledge when Ōmiwa priests had presided over Miki's funeral the year before. The followers explained that they sent an invitation to Ōmiwa Kyōkai but received a message that no one would be able to attend the ceremonies. The priest then left with the warning, "You will regret this" (Nakayama Zenye 12). The police soon intervened and the ceremonies could not be completed.

The police forced followers who were not related to the Nakayamas to leave the premises immediately. The chief of the Ichinomoto police expressed his regret having had to take such measures, but insisted the law was the law and Shinnosuke lacked prefectural permission to allow people to gather in large numbers. The chief of police then advised Shinnosuke to obtain official recognition for the Tenrikyō movement (Arakitōryō Henshūbu 2003b, 82; NDS 62). Shinnosuke approached Izō about the matter and received the Honseki's blessing to go to Tokyo to apply for prefectural recognition.

I shall wash clean this place of origin. I shall wash until the difference between silver and gold becomes clear. I shall make the truth of this Residence clear. The one truth in the Residence, the one truth of the Jiba, is to stand alone. But for the time being I allow another place... I shall allow those who are concerned to come together and begin the procedure. But you must keep in mind the original intent and the path of God (Os 1: 135-136, Meiji 21 [1888] March 9; TOMD 1990, 25).

Leading followers subsequently held a conference at the house of Iida Iwajirō in Ando Village. There has been the suggestion that there were two opposing factions who voiced their opinions at this meeting. One favored a degree of “self-serving” compromise with Shintō authorities while the other faction, to which Iwajirō belonged, felt that Miki’s teachings were incompatible with State Shintō (Toyoshima 136). Regardless of the sentiments expressed by Iwajirō’s faction, the decision was made to produce an application to the Shintō Honkyoku to establish a Tenrikyō headquarters in Tokyo and petition to relocate the headquarters to the Jiba at a later date.

Shinnosuke decided to obtain a letter of recommendation from the kaichō of Ōmiwa Kyōkai and had Moriya Hideo (son of Chikuzen) arrange a meeting. With this letter in hand, Shinnosuke then went to Tokyo accompanied by Hirano Narazō and Matsumura Kichitarō on March 31, 1888. Once there, Shinnosuke met a number of bishops from the Shintō Honkyoku. Having secured another letter of recommendation from Inaba Masakuni (1834-1898), the head (*kanchō*) of the Shintō Honkyoku on April 5, Shinnosuke applied for official permission to establish the Tenri organization in Tokyo Prefecture. The long efforts to gain official recognition finally came to fruition on April 10, 1888 when permission to found the Shintō Tenri Kyōkai was granted (NSD 70-76). As a legally recognized religious organization placed in the supervision of the Shintō Honkyoku,



Tenrikyō members gained the right to assemble to worship, a right they were previously denied.

Izō soon warned the followers that the step they were undertaking was but a temporary one and stressed the importance of being connected with the Jiba.<sup>53</sup> Yet Shinnosuke and the leading followers were hesitant to enact the petition to the government to relocate the headquarters back to Jiba for the time being. They feared if they acted too soon, it would appear as a 'shallow trick,' and nullify their legal sanction. Their hesitancy to turn in the application was also a sign of their belief that their request would not come easily—a belief hardened by their unsuccessful attempts with prefectural authorities in years past.

Soon, however, the illness of the Honseki in July 1888 urged them to put their trust in the kami, abandon their hesitancy, and turn in the papers to obtain permission to move the headquarters to Jiba.<sup>54</sup> In the *Osashizu* it was made clear that it was against the divine will to keep the headquarters in Tokyo for this long. The fact that followers came to the Tokyo headquarters to request the sacred food (*goku*) elicited Izō's concern.<sup>55</sup> While Izō allowed the *goku* to be distributed at the Tokyo headquarters, he emphasized that the *goku* had to have come from Jiba (Os 1: 152-153, Meiji 21 [1888] April 29). "Although this outcome was a natural one, in the eyes of God the Parent, it was very grave" (Nakayama Zenye

---

<sup>53</sup> "The present path is only for the time being; it is but a narrow path. This is a worldly path. In the world it may be considered great. [However] up until now, I have taught and you have heard about God's path" (Os 1: 145-146, Meiji 21 [1888] April 16).

<sup>54</sup> "You should be able to understand that I am indicating the worldly path through this physical disorder. You must not miss this lesson. In the world you do not worry much about the pain in the leg, the ache of the hand. However, even in the world, if diarrhea comes to you suddenly and you suffer pain, you must do what is to be done in haste" (Os 1: 185, Meiji 21 [1888] July 2; TOMD 1990, 26).

<sup>55</sup> The sacred food or *goku* at this time came in the form of *konpeitō* sweets. It was later changed to its present form—uncooked rice grains—in 1904, when government authorities became increasingly suspicious of the ingredients in the sugar candies. Refer to Os (6: 4511-4514, Meiji 37 [1904] March 29) and TOMD (1990, 68-70) for Izō's authorization of the change.

15). Shinnosuke and the others turned in the application to Nara Prefecture to relocate the headquarters and it was granted. The *Osashizu* during this time stressed the importance on the Jiba even more. This is clearly indicated as the followers stated to Izō their resolve to move the headquarters to Jiba:

Now I shall settle the truth at the Jiba. There is a vast difference between the truth of the Jiba and the truth of the world. They change the place and call it the headquarters. Even the authorities say this. People say the headquarters is over there but they do not understand anything at all. Because the one truth exists at the Jiba, peace will reign in the world (Os 1: 185-186, Meiji 21 [1888] July 2; TOMD 1990, 27).

As branch churches were established with Izō's mediation and approval, the fact that church headquarters was relocated to the Jiba solidified its authority over these branch churches by virtue of being located Miki's designated sacred spot. Once the Shintō Tenri Kyōkai was established in Tokyo, a number of religious associations (*kō*) extant in 1888 hoped to establish branch churches (*bunkyōkai*, *shikyōkai*) of the new organization in their respective areas. Before the headquarters could be relocated to Jiba, Moroi Kunisaburō petitioned to Izō on establishing a *bunkyōkai* in Shizuoka Prefecture in May. Although Izō granted him permission, Kunisaburō was told to wait a year before beginning the application process (Os 1: 45-46, Meiji 21 [1888] May 20). However, Kunisaburō allowed his enthusiasm to overtake him as he failed to comply with Izō's instructions and immediately petitioned to prefectural authorities to establish a branch church. Not only was Kunisaburō's petition rejected, he soon became ill. Upon his request for *Osashizu*, he was told to "Remain still for the time being" (Os 1: 192, Meiji 21 [1888] July 11; Masui 1971, 12). Even after Nara Prefecture accepted Tenrikyō's relocation of their headquarters to Jiba on July 22 1888,

Kunisaburō and others were encouraged to wait to establish their branch churches until “the Jiba can be firmly settled” following the inauguration service (*kaienshiki*) of Tenrikyō headquarters on the fiftieth anniversary of the founding of Miki’s teaching (the 26th of the tenth lunar month of 1888). Izō also stated that once the Jiba could be “settled,” the churches established with permission from Jiba would last for countless generations (Os 1: 214-215, Meiji 21 [1888] August 9; Masui 1971, 13).

As the first branch churches were formed in late 1888 and in 1889, their members held hopes that they could perform the Kagura Zutome at their respective churches. Hirano Narazō of Kōriyama Bunkiyōkai made a request for permission to use the Kagura masks at their Tsutome services. Izō refused, determining the uniqueness of the Jiba as the only place where the Kagura Zutome could be performed. Though Izō granted permission to Kōriyama Bunkiyōkai to use the musical instruments (*narimono*) at their services, he conveyed that the items related to the Kagura could only be used at the Jiba.<sup>56</sup> This message was made even clearer when Moroi Kunisaburō petitioned Izō so he could continue to use the Kagura masks at his branch church. Though Kunisaburō was the only missionary who received Miki’s permission to use the Kagura masks at the monthly services conducted at his *kō* in Shizuoka during her lifetime, Izō explicitly maintained his stance against using the Kagura masks

---

<sup>56</sup> “You think that those who perform the Service [Tsutome] are one in truth (*ri*). However, you must ponder the truth of those who perform the Service at the Jiba. The Jiba is the one place of origin. When people of all places devote themselves to the Jiba, truth will settle. If you understand the truth of those who perform the Service of the Jiba, you will understand that the use of the musical instruments at your church is completely in accord with the truth. Until now you have decorated your altar with the articles of the Service. I shall make truth clear. Among the articles of the Service which I have allowed you to use, there are some representing the creation of man [i.e., the Kagura masks]. I direct that these be used only at the Jiba” (Os 1: 391-392, Meiji 22 [1889] March 31; TOMD 1990, 33).

at the services of branch churches.<sup>57</sup> In this way Tenrikyō headquarters maintained a monopoly on the central ritual of the religion and further stressed the uniqueness of the Jiba in a concrete form.

At about the same time, the Meiji Constitution was adopted in February 1889. This proved to be a significant development for the nascent Tenrikyō institution, since it granted conditional religious freedom to the people of Japan, a freedom “within limits not prejudicial to peace and order, and not antagonistic to their duties as subjects” (quoted in Gluck 57). Once the issue of official recognition of Tenrikyō as a Shintō Honkyoku subsect was settled along with the obtainment of legal status for local branch churches, Tenrikyō followers who burned with the conviction they were being protected by God the Parent and the ‘everliving’ (*zonmei*) Nakayama Miki were free to spread her message of universal salvation as far and wide as they could. Many miraculous accounts of cured illnesses were attributed to missionaries who administered the Sazuke. The new religion began to spread like wildfire among people who were ill but could not afford medical treatment, which remained costly in Japan during the Meiji era. However, as Miki’s tenth nensai approached, Tenrikyō attracted the suspicious eye of the public and the state, thus revealing the limitations of the religious freedom guaranteed by Article 28 of the Meiji Constitution.

---

<sup>57</sup> “The masks are only for Jiba (*men wa Jiba kagiri*)” (Os 1: 405-406, Meiji 22 [1889] April 24). Moroi Kunisaburō had asked Miki’s permission to use the Kagura masks at his services from about 1884. Miki remained silent for some time before giving her reply: “Sah, sah, I permit it. It is not I who permit it. It is God who permits it.” Kunisaburō continued to use the masks until January 1889 (TJKH 673).

### The Secret Directives and their implications

By 1894 Tenrikyō had approximately 760 branch churches and 13,316 religious instructors (NSD 189-190). The momentum of Tenrikyō's growth also caught the attention of Daniel Crosby Greene, an American Christian scholar and missionary residing in Japan, who published his article "Tenrikyō, or the Teaching of the Heavenly Reason" the following year.<sup>58</sup> By 1896, there were 1,292 Tenrikyō churches spread throughout every prefecture in Japan with the exception of Okinawa (Ōya 30-31, n. 30).

While social opposition toward Tenrikyō dates many years before, in 1890 Buddhist priests held public lectures that demanded the elimination of Tenrikyō. Such lectures may have been prompted by the actions of a few Tenrikyō members who were caught up in the fervor of *haibutsu kishaku*. There are surviving anecdotes that claim how some Tenrikyō converts threw their Buddhist altars in the river only to be discovered later by aggressively devoted Buddhist communities downstream (Oguri 1969, 199). Tenrikyō ministers attempted to respond to the criticism by holding lectures of their own arguing for the elimination of Buddhism. Ministers from the Kawaramachi Bunkiyōkai in Kyoto were among the first to hold such lectures and they requested Izō's permission for assistance from headquarters (Os 1: 887-888, Meiji 23 [1890] November 21). However, Oguri Junko has argued Tenrikyō ministers were at a great disadvantage challenging Buddhist priests in public debates and often found themselves on the defensive (1969, 104). As the failed Great Promulgation

---

<sup>58</sup> Originally published in *Transactions of the Asiatic Society of Japan* 22, and reprinted in 1896 in *Japan Evangelist* 3 (Earhart 1983, 161).

Campaign revealed, Buddhist priests were traditionally more skilled in the art of public debate compared to other religionists. Villagers and townspeople also attempted to stop their peers from converting and/or continuing their faith in Tenrikyō (Ueda H. 2002, 1: 38).

A number of books and sensational newspaper articles critical of Tenrikyō also appeared in print. Much criticism came from arguments that Tenrikyō conversions led to social instability as they undermined the traditional religious affiliations long held by village communities. Other criticisms against the religion centered on how improper it was for musical instruments such as shamisen—instruments associated with the pleasure quarters—to be used for religious services (*ibid.* 38-39). Shinshū priests were said to have been especially vocal in accusing Tenrikyō of sexual transgressions following the performances of the Tsutome and Teodori dances (Oguchi and Takagi 474; 478, n. 34). By allowing men and women to congregate together, Tenrikyō was said to encourage the corruption of public morality. There was also the issue of Tenrikyō members obstructing medical treatment with Sazuke prayers and distributions of sacred goku and water. Lastly were criticisms of Tenrikyō ministers forcibly requiring their followers to make excessive donations and have them quit their occupations to devote themselves to the growth of the movement (Ueda H. 2002, 1: 38-39). Tenrikyō's explosive increase in membership stemmed from an inspired congregation that was more than willing to devote their entire lives engaged in proselytization activities.

Once law enforcement officials became entangled with the rising social opposition against Tenrikyō, the government made various inquiries into Tenrikyō's doctrine and rituals in 1894 and 1895 (*ibid.* 38). In February 1895 the Shrine and Temple Bureau of the Home Ministry (Naimushō Shajikyoku) sought

explanations concerning negative articles on Tenrikyō that were circulated daily in Tokyo newspapers. For this reason, Tenrikyō officials Matsumura, Maegawa, and Hashimoto left for the capital (NSD 190). Yet despite increasing social opposition and ostracization by the public and the media, Tenrikyō headquarters was able to conduct the 'tenth nensai of Oyasama' without incident in early 1896. In fact, over seventy police officers helped direct the crowds who gathered for the ceremonies (*ibid.* 215). Approximately one hundred thousand followers attended the event (Murakami 1963, 157).<sup>59</sup> However, once the nensai ceremonies concluded, Izō issued timely talks that were later understood as warnings of the upcoming government suppression and defections by church ministers.<sup>60</sup>

On April 6, 1896, no longer able to ignore the accusations and criticism that continued to mount against Tenrikyō, the Home Ministry distributed Directive Twelve (known as the *himitsu kunrei* or Secret Directives) with the intention to curb Tenrikyō's activities nationwide. The directives directly sought to confront the three most severe insinuations circulated by the media and other critics against Tenrikyō: (1) allowing male and female members to congregate amongst themselves which encouraged sexual indiscretions; (2) the obstruction of medical care from its followers; and (3) the extortion of members through excessive, compulsory donations (NSD 216-217; Ueda H. 2003a, 45; TOMD 1998, 60).<sup>61</sup>

<sup>59</sup> An inside source claims the number exceeded two hundred thousand (Nakayama Zenye 31).

<sup>60</sup> "Astonishing events shall occur, but do not be astonished" (Os 4: 2644, Meiji 29 [1896] March 24; Yamamoto and Nakajima 411-412). Also: "Sah, sah, water shall appear. Filth will be mixed within and there will be polluted and undrinkable water. [The filth] will be completely drawn out. Listen carefully and know how to avoid this. Sah, write this down. Undrinkable, polluted, muddy waters shall appear. You cannot imagine what kind of path lies ahead" (Os 4: 2654, Meiji 29 [1896] March 31).

<sup>61</sup> A complete translation of Directive Number Twelve is as follows:

Recently of late Tenrikyō gathers its adherents in a single hall and allows men and women to mix together, creating a situation that is liable to lead to the corruption of moral

The first charge seems to be an unfounded accusation, as there is no clear evidence such indiscretions took place.<sup>62</sup> The second issue concerning Tenrikyō followers obstructing medical treatment, however, was a reality in some cases. People who took medicine while they prayed to the kami for a divine cure were considered lacking in true faith and chastised by early missionaries for their 'two-sided minds' (*futasuji-gokoro* 二筋心) (Matsumura 12-15). Missionaries encouraged potential converts to reject medicine altogether for Sazuke prayers and divine protection gained by partaking goku and sacred water. This must have been a reoccurring issue as Izō cautioned followers in a number of *Osashizu* against rejecting medicine and encouraged them to focus their healing on people who were considered incurable by medical professionals.<sup>63</sup>

The third issue was most likely an exaggeration of phenomena visible to outsiders: the almost reckless manner in which members contributed to the

---

standards. [The Tenrikyō church] also gives out sacred water and sacred charms which mislead the foolish [masses], ultimately causing them to reject medicine. Finally, [Tenrikyō adherents] are led to make reckless donations.

Due to the gradual prevalence of these evil practices, there is a pressing necessity to bring them under control. Police surveillance will be increased in the future, either through regular inspections of places open to the public or secret measures to uncover misconduct. Activities which are found to violate the penal code will face immediate and appropriate disciplinary action. Necessary steps will be taken against those who do not follow [the law], which include stopping ritual prayers (*kitō*) and sermons in progress. Moreover, regular reports on these situations are expected, together with increased enforcement, with utmost attention particularly directed toward methods of money collection. Lastly, the failure of the Tenrikyō church to concede and put an end to evil practices [that violate] the prohibition against ritual prayers by Shintō and Buddhist sects, public standards of decency, or [acceptable levels of] donation—likewise must face disciplinary action.

Instructions issued as noted above

Meiji 29 [1896] April 6

Home Secretary Yoshikawa Akimasa

<sup>62</sup> Donald Crosby Greene offered the following observation in 1895, "I am aware that charges of gross immorality are made against the adherents of the Tenrikyō. They are brought by great persistency by Buddhist writers but it is my conviction that... these charges are not justified" (65).

<sup>63</sup> "There is nothing originally in the teachings that make the claim doctors and medicine are not necessary. When those beyond the help of doctors are saved—once their help and medicines have been employed—you [turn around and] say to everyone the help of doctors and medicine is not necessary. Where did this come from? No one complains about saving people who are beyond medical help. The realization of being saved by God is just the beginning. Each of you are turning an easy path into a difficult path" (Os 1: 768-769, Meiji 23 [1890] July 7). Also: "To say someone is beyond the help of doctors, is like casting the person's life away. Saving such people is the basis (*dai*) of this path" (Os 3: 1940, Meiji 26 [1893] October 17).



Tenrikyō organization. Adherents who were inspired to follow Miki's example of self-inflicted poverty contributed large donations known as *otsukushi* to the church. Such donations were derided as highly irrational by many outside observers, and the Tenrikyō liturgical chant "*Ashiki o harōte tasuke tamae Tenri-Ō-no-Mikoto*" (Sweep away evils and please save us, Tenri-Ō-no-Mikoto) was commonly ridiculed as "*Yashiki o harōte ta uri tamae ten binbō no mikoto*" (Please sell away our homes and rice patties, heavenly god of poverty). *Otsukushi* were considered signs of strong conviction and occurred often enough that it would take years before Tenrikyō could outgrow the widespread public presumption that converts were required to donate all their wealth to the religion.<sup>64</sup>

As the directives were issued to all prefectures, crackdowns and suppression of public worship intensified. Entrances of local churches were boarded up to discourage followers from making donations. It was not a rare occurrence for the police to interrupt services and sermons. Police stood outside Nakashiro Shikyōkai (five branch churches in 1896) in Kyoto and recorded the names of followers who entered (TJKH 433). In Yamanashi Prefecture, police interrogated everyone who visited Kōfu Shikyōkai (eight branch churches in 1896) on service days (*ibid.* 238). As a result of such scrutiny from the police, many of the faithful stopped worshipping at these churches. Members of Kōfu Shikyōkai also became embroiled in a serious dispute over a suggestion to replace their head minister, whom some members felt was too old to effectively deal with the severe oppression brought on by the Secret Directives (*ibid.*). The head minister of Nishinari Shikyōkai (three branch churches) in Osaka went missing in April 1898 as a result of increased pressure from the state (*ibid.* 494).

---

<sup>64</sup> For a discussion on the public perception of Tenrikyō as an exploitative movement, see Murakami (1974, 62; 80-82), Oguri (1970, 54-57; 156-163), and Sugihara and Plath (24-31; 180-181).

A Tenrikyō source reflecting on the situation at the time states, “Rebuked by society, frightened by the police, and deprived of the freedom of worship in the church, Tenrikyō almost stopped breathing” (TOMD 1998, 60).

The Secret Directives also caused various branch churches to lose their prefectural sanction. Officials in Nagano Prefecture revoked legal sanction from two local Tenrikyō churches (Satō 191-192). The same also occurred in Kagawa and Hyogo Prefectures in June 1897 and March 1901 (Ueda H. 2003b, 2: 53). Officials from Osaka Prefecture revoked the sanction of Izumi Shikyōkai of Sakai City and its two branch churches as late as 1907. The mounting pressure from the state produced a fear that the termination of legal status for Tenrikyō as a whole was not far behind.

The Shintō Honkyoku pressed the Tenri Kyōkai, its subordinate organization, to revise elements of its doctrine and practice or risk being disbanded by the state. Faced with the severity of the situation brought by the Home Ministry directive, the Tenrikyō leadership inquired of Izō how to appropriately respond.

Those who oppose Me are also children dear to My heart. Yet dearer are those who pray to Me. ...Unite your minds in accord with My will, unite. If they tell you, “Don’t,” then answer, “Very well.” If they tell you, “No,” then answer, “Very well.” I shall be watching (Os 4: 2663-2664, Meiji 29 [1896] April 21; TOMD 1990, 56-57).

The leaders within the organization followed Izō’s advice and decided to accept the Home Ministry’s demands until the present wave of persecution subsided. An emergency meeting among Tenrikyō ministers took place between May 18 and 21. Shinnosuke and the clergy presented the following changes one by one to Izō, who subsequently gave his approval: (1) to cease performing the first

section of the *Mikagura-uta* during monthly and daily services; (2) to cease from wearing the kagura masks at monthly services (masks to be placed in front of the dancers on *hassoku* tables); (3) to only allow men to perform the Kagura Zutome and play the musical instruments; (4) to cease the distribution and use of *mamori-fuda* as objects of worship and replace them with sacred mirrors; (5) change the divine name to Tenri-Ōkami 天理大神 (NSD 220-224; Os 4: 2672-2675, Meiji 29 [1896] May 20; Ueda H. 2003b, 1: 48-50). Tenrikyō officials later sought Izō's permission to replace the use of the shamisen and *kokyū* (bowed lute) with the Satsuma biwa and *yagumo-goto* (two-stringed zither) respectively in church services (Os 4: 2839-2840, Meiji 30 [1897] November 20; TJ 371; 907).

The above changes represented a move to reduce tension in a number of ways. Tenrikyō was pressured by the Shintō Honkyoku to halt the performance of the first verse of the *Mikagura-uta* potentially for the reason it was the most mystical section of the Kagura Zutome ritual. Each of the ten dancers symbolically represented one of the ten kami and their respective protections, which included the protections of male and female sexual organs and functions.<sup>65</sup> Also, during the ritual, the dancers representing Izanagi and Izanami touched their hands twice at each repetition of '*Ashiki o harôte tasuke tamae Tenri-Ō-no-Mikoto*,' which also represented sexual contact.<sup>66</sup> (The first verse is repeated a total of twenty-one times before moving on to the second verse.) The repression of the first verse therefore may stem from an almost 'Victorian' conservatism on the part of the Home Ministry and the Shintō Honkyoku to ban the performance

---

<sup>65</sup> Kunisazuchi represented the protection of skin, joining and the female sexual organ; Tsukiyomi represented the protection of bones, support, and the male sexual organ; Izanagi represented the human seed or sperm; Izanami the seedplot or egg and mother's womb. See chapter four of *The Doctrine of Tenrikyo* for more information on the protections of the ten kami.

<sup>66</sup> Presently, the dancers representing Izanagi and Izanami are exclusively married couples. However, I have no way to confirm how long this convention has been in place.

of a dance symbolizing the process of human reproduction. The move to disallow female members to perform the dance or the musical instruments also probably stemmed from the same reasoning.

Further, the first verse also explicitly contains the divine appellation 'Tenri-Ō-no-Mikoto.' Shintō authorities were vigilant over controlling the ranks of kami. Since Tenri-Ō-no-Mikoto was not a kami mentioned in the official sacred texts the *Kojiki* and *Nihongi*, the state denied the Tenrikyō organization from using the rank 'no-Mikoto' for their deity and were thus required to change of the appellation of the main kami to Tenri-Ōkami. The state may have been critical of the *mamori-fuda* for the reason they were inscribed with the divine appellation Tenri-Ō-no-Mikoto ('*Hōshū Tenri-Ō-no-Mikoto shugo*' 奉修天理王命守護 was a common inscription found on the *mamori-fuda* talismans). Finally, the act of preventing the kagura masks to be worn in addition to changes already mentioned served to diminish the ritual power of the Kagura Zutome.

As discussed in the Introduction, Rodney Stark and William Sims Bainbridge have argued that new sectarian movements are apt to appear within a religious movement when it reduces its degree of tension with the larger society (1985, 134-138). Although the theories of the two authors are mainly derived from examples of new religious movements in the United States (which essentially is an unregulated religious market compared to nineteenth century Japan), the theories appear to be applicable in this particular case as well. The severity of the Secret Directives prompted the Tenrikyō leadership to reduce its high degree of tension with its political environment. As changes in Tenrikyō services and ritual implements were adopted and put into place, signs of dissent

among members of the core leadership soon rose to the surface,<sup>67</sup> a development that supports the theory of tension reduction presented by Stark and Bainbridge. It has been suggested that Iwajirō had grown increasingly wary of headquarters policy from the moment legal recognition was obtained with the Shintō Honkyoku (Toyoshima 137). The Tenrikyō leadership's response to alleviate pressure from the Secret Directives not only served to further alienate him but also provided the spark to challenge Iburi Izō's charismatic authority. The change of the official object of worship to a sacred mirror would become an emotionally charged issue for Iwajirō and his followers.

### The early life of Iida Iwajirō

Iwajirō was born on March 23, 1858 as the eldest son of Iida Bunkichi and Tei. His uncle Zenroku soon adopted him into the main family. Iwajirō experienced severe stomach pains in 1863 at the age of six. By December, Iwajirō's life was in danger; Zenroku and his wife visited Miki and asked for her help. She is reported to have said she had been waiting for the Iidas, and headed out to Ando Village herself. Miki arrived and said she had come to visit her uncle from a previous life. Upon stroking his belly, Miki cured Iwajirō's pain and he was able to eat a *bota-mochi*. In a week he was able to play with fellow children of the village. Iwajirō also received the *mizu no sazu* at this time from Miki. If this was indeed the case, it makes Iwajirō one of the first individuals, if not the very first, to have received a Sazuke transmission from Miki. Miki is also

---

<sup>67</sup> Iwajirō's schism occurred almost simultaneously with an event known as the Maehashi jiken, where two other leading members (Maegawa Kikutarō and Hashimoto Kiyoshi) who were involved in public relations and thereby regularly dealt with government officials during the enforcement of the Secret Directives, handed in their resignations in late 1897. Refer to NSD (235-244) and Ueda H. (2003d) for more information.

attributed with 'rediscovering' the well that was on the Iidas' property (KNH 171; Toyoshima 132) where Iwajirō drew his water. From this time on, it is said that this water had the capacity to cure illness (TJ 24). Also, while the water of Ando Village was known for its metallic taste, the water from the Iidas' well was of good quality (Matsutani 2001, 157-158).

Murakami Shigeyoshi has stated that Iwajirō's adoptive father, Zenroku, was an influential landowner who provided Miki an entrance to propagating the faith in the area surrounding the historic Hōryūji. He has also written that Zenroku's importance to the growth of Tenrikyō in its early years was comparable to that of Yamanaka Chūshichi and Iburi Izō (Murakami 1975, 48; 50). Further, it has been suggested that the nascent Ando congregation as a whole contributed in spreading the faith to Osaka and the rest of Kawachi Province (Matsutani 2001, 156).

The young Iwajirō visited Miki often and directly received her instruction until he began his formal education at the age of thirteen (1870). Upon returning home, he often experienced stomach pains, which would subside once he went back to Shōyashiki to Miki's side. In 1876, at the age of nineteen, Iwajirō experienced another serious illness, which was cured when he was brought on a sliding door to Miki. At this time, Iwajirō was specially designated as a *ninsoku no yashiro* 人足の社, the only person to receive such recognition other than Ueda Naraito (TJ 24; 725).<sup>68</sup> Tenrikyō sources claim that it remains unclear what this designation (literally, 'worker shrine') specifically meant (*ibid.* 725). On the other hand, the self-made 'researcher of religions,' Toyoshima Yasukuni, presents a

---

<sup>68</sup> While not officially recognized by any Tenrikyō source I am aware of, Yamamoto Kichigorō is occasionally identified as a third individual to have been designated as *ninsoku no yashiro* (Yashima 205).

quote attributed to Miki when she bestowed this designation on Iwajirō that suggested he would eventually become a 'shrine' of the kami like herself and therefore be a new source of divine revelation (135). Whichever the case, considering that Ueda Naraito was eventually selected by Izō as his spiritual heir, it would have been a designation that held a special significance in the movement.

In 1881 Iwajirō became the head of Sekizen-kō, a religious association he was encouraged to create with the followers of Wakai Village since both Ando and Wakai belonged to the same district of Hegure. The late Matsuo Ichibei, Matsuo Yozō's father, introduced the faith to the majority of followers in Wakai. In several years time, with the effort of nine other missionaries, Sekizen gained followers in the provinces of Kishū (Wakayama) and Iga (Shiga). In due time, Iwajirō was leading a religious association that claimed to have converted between seven and eight hundred member households (Matsutani 2001, 156; TJKH 561).

Following the passing of Nakayama Miki, Iwajirō continued to be an active member of the Tenrikyō movement. He played the *fue* for the Tsutome performed at Miki's first nensai. Also, as mentioned above, his residence was utilized when the leading followers held a special meeting about obtaining official recognition under the Shintō Honkyoku. Upon receiving the sanction to establish the Shintō Tenri Kyōkai, Iwajirō became a junior minister official (*honbu jun'yaku-in*) of the organization. On March 26, 1892, Heian Shikyōkai was established with Iwajirō as its founding minister. The name Heian 平安 was selected by combining the characters 平 from the district of Hegure 平群郡 and 安 from Ando 安堵 Village (TJKH 562).

While Iwajirō's position in the Tenrikyō institution, a *honbu jun'yaku-in*, is recorded in church histories, it nevertheless remains unclear what his specific responsibilities were other than overlooking the congregation of Heian Shikyōkai. This stems from the fact that his name is conspicuously absent from the *Osashizu* until the Mizu-yashiki jiken. (It is possible to surmise the duties certain individuals were assigned to at headquarters with a systematic survey of *Osashizu* passages.) One can speculate several possible reasons for why Iwajirō's name is not mentioned in the *Osashizu* until December 1896. One possibility for the absence was that Iwajirō did not have a need to approach Izō for spiritual guidance. Though this is a probable scenario, most of Miki's devoted followers are shown to have approached Izō at least on one occasion by the mid-1890s. On the other hand, it is possible that Iwajirō never approached Izō because he refused to accept the authority of the Honseki. Some of Izō's words in his instructions to accede to state pressure at the time of the Secret Directives suggest there already was a significant degree of dissent within the ecclesiastical order.<sup>69</sup> When Iwajirō's name does finally make its first appearance in the *Osashizu*, Izō's instructions seem to mention that Iwajirō's insubordination had long been an unresolved issue (see following section).

Finally, the absence of Iwajirō's name in the *Osashizu* may be explained by the possibility that he did receive spiritual guidance from Izō, but the instructions were not canonized for either one of the following two reasons. First, it was possible that no one was present to record Izo's instructions to Iwajirō. Second, these instructions were recorded, but were later eliminated

---

<sup>69</sup> "But even those who pray to Me, if they do not follow My will, they are the same as those who oppose Me. ...That the world should oppose Me is natural. [But] opposition from within the path washes away the fertilizer I have spread" (Os 4: 2663-2664, Meiji 29 [1896] April 21; TOMD 1990, 56-57).



from the canon. There are precedents for each possibility. First, there was no official present to record Izō's words during his first Sazuke transmission that occurred on the night that he gained the status of Honseki (Masui 1: 191-194). Second, an early incident in which members of the Shidōkai confraternity (the precursor of Kawaramachi) were charged with heresy, is completely absent from the *Osashizu*. This charge was initiated by four officials from Tenrikyō headquarters who felt that Shidōkai members were treating their minister Fukaya Genjirō with a level of devotion that could potentially undermine the central authority of the nascent institution. Shidōkai members had created a special seat for their minister, called '*taiboku no seki*,' because Izō often referred to Fukaya as '*taiboku*,' or a 'great tree' in his revelations (TJKH 184). The matter was quickly resolved with the removal of this seat and a formal apology from Shidōkai ministers. Needless to say, there are no passages in the *Osashizu* that have any references to Fukaya as '*taiboku*.'

In any event, a compelling case can be established to show that Iwajirō felt a considerable degree of dissatisfaction toward Tenrikyō headquarters. According to Toyoshima, Iwajirō was critical of the policy of accepting excessive donations from their followers and he argued that it was against the spirit of Miki's teaching (137). One can note the government's suspicions of Tenrikyō extortion, and the institution was at one time economically comfortable enough to pay off the debts of its parent institution the Shintō Honkyoku in 1894 (Arakitōryō Henshūbu 2002, 33). However, as a result of his criticism, Iwajirō was treated coldly by his peers and left out of the decision-making process on important policy changes (Toyoshima 137).

Fame of Iwajirō's ability to cure illness with the *mizu no sazu* spread far and wide. Even followers of other church affiliations began to stop over in Ando

on their way to Jiba to receive well water from Iwajirō. Word of this reached Tenrikyō headquarters and incurred criticism from other ministers. The fact that Iburi Izō bestowed a *mizu no sazu* grant to a number of followers that was procedurally different from Iwajirō's version of the ritual may have been initiated as a way to keep Iwajirō's influence in check. Those who received Izō's version of the *mizu no sazu* were only required to take three sips of any cup of water to transform it into water that possessed healing properties (Masui 1994, 1: 195-197). By the time of the Mizu-yashiki jiken, Heian Shikyōkai had one hundred fourteen religious instructors (*kyōshi*) and over one thousand five hundred member households (TJ 24).

### Iwajirō's kamigakari experiences

Iwajirō suffered from an attack of severe stomach pain in November 1894 upon returning from missionary work. After stopping over the residence of Umetani Shirōbei, the head minister of Senba Bunkyo-kai in Osaka, Iwajirō had Umetani administer the Sazuke of Breath (*iki no sazu*) as a petition to the kami to heal his sudden illness. Following the ritual, Umetani proceeded to take a sip of water that had been offered to the kami and sprayed the water in Iwajirō's face. Umetani's action appears to have jolted Iwajirō into a kamigakari state. Iwajirō's facial expression hardened as he glared at Umetani and said in a voice unbecoming of him, "That was rude, Umetani Shirōbei! What on earth are you doing? Do you think [I am] a mere human being? [I am] a kami! How dare you treat a kami in this manner!" (Toyoshima 137). Umetani quickly apologized and Iwajirō returned to his senses. Having no memory of the words he spoke during his kamigakari, Iwajirō is said to have shuddered when they were relayed back

to him. Iwajirō, however, would in time begin to see visions and hear voices of the kami that inspired him to express his dissent ever more harshly toward the Tenrikyō organization.

Beginning in 1896, Iwajirō stopped taking meals at Tenrikyō headquarters. This action taken by Iwajirō is remarkably similar to Miki's refusal to eat when she was detained by local police because she is said to have considered the meals she was served to be 'impure' because they were prepared without sincerity (KTK 238). Iwajirō also stopped attending meetings at headquarters and instead sent representatives in his place. On the night of the twenty-second of the ninth lunar month, Miki, dressed in her red kimono, appeared to Iwajirō in a vision and uttered the following message:

Sah, sah, please listen [to what I have to say]. As of today you are not the only one I spoke to. You are aware of what occurred twenty-one years ago. [But I am here] to receive you [as a shrine]. Though [I] designated the Honseki, there is human sentiment mixed [with his revelations]. How regretful, how unfortunate this is.

You are fully aware of the hardships I endured. The minds of [the people] near [you] are one with the world (*sekainami*). There are the lectures called the Besseki, however, this is also one with the world. While they speak of the true teachings with their words, their minds are mistaken. This is far too unfortunate. [Take up a brush and] write, write (Toyoshima 137).

The event marked the beginning of Iwajirō's inspired tanka known as the *Mimi-utsushi* ('aural transcriptions'). According to Daidōkyō's current understanding, Iwajirō's revelation on this night signified the fulfillment of his role as *ninsoku no yashiro*, a designation bestowed upon him by Miki in 1876. (The phrase "You are aware of what occurred twenty-one years ago" refers to the time Iwajirō first received the designation *ninsoku no yashiro* according to the traditional Japanese

count.) Iwajirō also attempted to delegitimize Izō's position by claiming that the revelations from the Honseki were imbued with 'human sentiment' (*ningen-gokoro*), and therefore could not be the direct words from the kami. The above message from Miki also criticized church headquarters and the Besseki system they adopted as being 'one with the world' and not sufficiently showing devotion to her divine path. According to Toyoshima, Iwajirō strongly felt that the Besseki system was an empty formality compared to the spiritual purity of Miki's teachings (*ibid.*).

As mentioned in the Introduction, Miki bestowed the Sazuke to adherents whom she felt were spiritually qualified, and Izō initially continued to do the same, transmitting the grant to missionaries who showed great devotion and acumen for bringing in new followers. However, the rise in Tenrikyō's membership during Izō's tenure increased the demand for Sazuke transmissions and led to the installment of the Besseki system in 1889. The Besseki lectures subsequently served to prepare initiates for Sazuke transmissions by inculcating in them basic Tenrikyō tenets and accounts of Miki's exemplary life (*hinagata*). The Besseki system thereby replaced a sacred one-to-one relationship in which the charismatic leader of the movement carefully discerned whether a follower was spiritually ready for the divine grant with what could be called an accelerated assembly line that churned out as many as five new missionaries a day. When it became known that plainclothes police were secretly attending the lectures in January 1890, an examination was introduced to screen future missionaries before they could begin the lectures and once again before receiving the Sazuke from Izō (Ueda H. 2004b, 68-69).

In one of Iwajirō's many visions, Miki once related, "I refuse to accept the mirrors. Make this sword the *shintai* and give it to Shinnosuke" (Toyoshima

138). Toyoshima suggests that Miki rejected the mirror as an object of worship because it was part of the imperial regalia and was considered to be a symbol of Amaterasu, a kami that is missing from Tenrikyō's divine pantheon. Yet instead of the gohei that was frequently used to enshrine the kami during Miki's lifetime, Iwajirō's revelations introduced a new object of worship—a paper sword nine centimeters long that symbolized the cutting of negative innen (*ibid.*).

Daidōkyō sources assert that Iwajirō initially wondered whether the visions he saw of Miki were delusions and therefore refrained from informing anyone of his revelations. Yet on a windy night in the eleventh lunar month of 1896, Iwajirō heard footsteps coming from outside his home before the sliding entrance blew open. Then suddenly, a giant warrior kami standing nearly three meters tall appeared before Iwajirō and said, "Sah, sah, [I,] the messenger kami, have arrived. You seem apprehensive to approach headquarters. But no matter" (*ibid.* 139). Iwajirō subsequently received another set of revelations from the kami, later revealed to be Tsukiyomi-no-Mikoto, who became his patron deity. Iwajirō's *Mimi-utsushi* from this time reads:

If all of you quickly enshrine this sword, you shall be granted all forms of protection. The talismans (*fuda*) were abolished in order to enshrine this sword. [The headquarters adopted] the mirror without knowing this. There will not even be the smallest amount of protection with the mirror. Understand this, all of you. I ask everyone: What do you think of this sword? It contains the heart of the parent (*ibid.*).

This new set of Iwajirō's revelations further criticizes Tenrikyō headquarters and Izō, this time for their ignorance as they adopted the incorrect object of worship. According to the revelations above, as long as the sacred mirror was the official

*shintai* installed at branch churches, Tenrikyō risked loss of divine protection that was guaranteed with Iwajirō's paper sword.

Iwajirō then consulted with his two closest confidants Ueda Zenbei<sup>70</sup> and Haruki Ikuzō and explained the contents of his revelations. Both of these two men became convinced that Iwajirō was selected by the kami as a prophet and were important figures in the Mizu-yashiki incident. Haruki had been an official of Heian Shikyōkai from its inception. According to Tenrikyō sources, Iwajirō became acquainted with Ueda Zenbei, the head minister of Kōjimachi Shikyōkai in Tokyo, either in March 1896 (TKSS 4: 482) or October 1895 when they attended the inauguration ceremony of Usa Shikyōkai in Oita (TJKH 562).<sup>71</sup> It has also been claimed that Ueda thereafter frequently visited Heian and together with Iwajirō began to express their discontent with headquarters' policy and criticized its ministers as they drank *sake* together (*ibid.*).

Certain Tenrikyō church histories suggest that Iwajirō began to coax members and ministers from other churches to his side as early as December 1895. At this time, Utsunomiya Ugenta, the head minister of the aforementioned Usa Shikyōkai made a thanksgiving pilgrimage to Jiba with an entourage of his officials (*yaku-in*). Just as this entourage was about to leave Jiba, four to five members of Heian Shikyōkai wished to thank the church for their recent hospitality and invited them to Ando Village. By that time, Utsunomiya had already left for Osaka, so the party initially declined the offer. However, the Heian followers were able to persuade a number of Usa Shikyōkai *yaku-in* to

---

<sup>70</sup> While they share their surname, there is little reason to believe that this Ueda Zenbei was related to Ueda Naraito.

<sup>71</sup> According to information in the *Osashizu*, the official representatives of Tenrikyō headquarters sent to the inauguration service of Usa Shikyōkai were Kita Jirōkichi, Yamanaka Hichihiko, and Yamazawa Tamezō (Os 3: mokuji 107-108), suggesting that Iwajirō and Zenbei most likely would have traveled to Oita City at their own expense.

come to Ando, and they thereafter became officials of the Mizu-yashiki. These new converts then returned to Usa in Kyushu and persuaded their head minister Utsunomiya and others to also make the switch, but instead received a deaf ear from their former associates (*ibid.* 95-96). The defectors then zealously encouraged Usa Shikyōkai members to join the Mizu-yashiki, which caused much confusion among the congregation.

In 1896 Hirano Narazō guarded the Hirahata road near his church and made worshipers heading to Ando go straight to Jiba. At the same time, Mizu-yashiki members on the Nara road were dispatched at Tanbaichi to forcibly bring to Ando pilgrims returning to Jiba. Such actions on both sides (*ibid.*) added to the mounting commotion surrounding the emerging schism as Iwajirō's revelations became ever more urgent.<sup>72</sup>

### The Mizu-yashiki jiken in the *Osashizu*

Shinbashira Nakayama Shinnosuke was greatly concerned over the circumstances since members of other churches became involved Iwajirō's reform movement. As the situation grew worse, Shinnosuke and leading followers approached Izō on a number of occasions to inquire how to deal with Iwajirō's claims that the kami were descending and speaking through him. There are total of twelve passages in the *Osashizu* related to the Mizu-yashiki jiken (eleven inquiries and one timely talk).<sup>73</sup> As there is not enough room in this

---

<sup>72</sup> "Make up your minds now and send a messenger to headquarters. [Tell them] the messenger of Tsukiyomi-no-Mikoto is here. From tomorrow, if headquarters [still] refuses to listen, the kami shall rain fire [upon them]. Now go! Go tonight!" (Toyoshima 140).

<sup>73</sup> The dates of these *Osashizu* are Meiji 29 December 7 (one inquiry and a timely talk at night); Meiji 30 June 3; July 3; July 14; August 2; November 13; 25; 27; and 29; December 11 and 23 (Ueda H. 2003c).

chapter to cover each passage in detail, remarks on these passages will be limited to a few highlights.

The earliest passage in the *Osashizu* that deals with the Mizu-yashiki incident is dated December 7, 1896. While it is entitled “Petition concerning the illness of Iida Iwajirō,” other records reveal the inquiry was not petitioned from Iwajirō but from an intermediary (*toritsugi-nin*) from headquarters (Ueda 2003c, 1: 54).

Sah, sah, the situation you inquire of, you do so because the situation is urgent. Many days have passed while you thought to yourselves the situation would resolve itself. But because nothing can be done, you have come prepared to rely on whatever directions I may give. This situation has gone on for a long time, but today I shall dispel your concern. You may especially worry over this, but it will not do to worry. Listen with care. Several years ago there was a similar situation. [It so happens] on the Path several years later, we have another situation (Os 4: 2713-2714, Meiji 29 [1896] December 7).

Because Izō's *Osashizu* in general were orally delivered in a stylized and abstract language, the precise contents of his messages have a tendency to be elusive.<sup>74</sup> In the passage quoted above (“Several years ago there was a similar situation”), Izō may be referring to the Sukezō jiken, but it is not entirely certain. The phrase “This situation has gone on for a long time,” may also suggest that Izō felt that Iwajirō was guilty of insubordination for some period of time, but again there is no way to confirm this. In the same December 7 *Osashizu*, the intermediary enacting the petition touches upon the subject of Iwajirō's ‘dream’—which

---

<sup>74</sup> As far as I am aware, there is no comprehensive commentary of the *Osashizu* published by Tenrikyō. Though my discovery of Fukaya (1987) came too late for it to be utilized in this present work, I highly recommend the source for anyone who plans to research Tenrikyō's history between 1887 and 1907 as it is arranged a number of significant *Osashizu* passages by topic. Other useful commentaries on the *Osashizu* include Yamamoto and Nakajima, Masui Kōshirō's *Osashizu no tebiki*.



appears to be a reference to the visit of the kami Tsukiyomi to the Mizu-yashiki. It is clear in his response that Izō makes no attempt to acknowledge the authenticity of Iwajirō's visions and revelations.<sup>75</sup> Instead Izō reprimanded the followers for their carelessness and encouraged them to work together in confronting the difficulty they were presently faced with.<sup>76</sup>

After a gap of six months, Izō was again approached in June 1897 concerning Iwajirō's claims of receiving divine revelations ("Petition for instructions regarding the case of Iida Iwajirō in Ando Village (He claims the kami descend upon him. We wish to know how to resolve the matter in the near future.)") While acknowledging Iwajirō's status as *ninsoku no yashiro*, Izō insisted that the actions of the head minister of Heian Shikyōkai were an act of self-aggrandizement. To elaborate:

As result of an event of some significance, he came to be called *ninsoku yashiro*. Yet no matter how much he wishes to do this and that, there is no way to handle the situation because he has buried his spiritual merit with his selfish ways (Os 4: 2772, Meiji 30 [1897] June 3).

The June *Osashizu* again suggests that Iwajirō's disobedience was an ongoing issue and advises those listening to carefully consider Iwajirō's potential motivation for making his claims.<sup>77</sup> Further, Izō warned that though Miki had given Iwajirō the *mizu no sazu* as gift to be treasured for a lifetime, Iwajirō

---

<sup>75</sup> "Sah, sah, because he cannot accept my instructions, he says something about a dream. You may wonder what kind of lesson [there is to be learned] through this situation" (Os 4: 2714, Meiji 29 [1896] December 7).

<sup>76</sup> "You must have your minds prepared for anything. The mind is of prime importance. Up until now you have been careless on this path. You cannot advance on the path so carelessly. The path can only exist as long as everyone [moves forward] hand in hand. (*ibid.*; Ueda H. 2003c, 1: 55).

<sup>77</sup> "The kami descend here, the kami descend there. It is truly difficult for everyone to know from where. I have heard much talk about his proclamations. It appears he is making outrageous statements at the moment. Discern the source of his statements carefully" (*ibid.*).

risked losing the efficacy of his grant though his “selfishness” (Ueda H. 2003c, 1: 58).

While Izō urged members to be vigilant in confronting Iwajirō,<sup>78</sup> there appears to have been an implicit reluctance on their part to adopt a strict course of action since Iwajirō was their colleague of many years.<sup>79</sup> Masui Isaburō and others were sent in an attempt to convince Iwajirō to retract his claims, but he refused to listen, seeing their attempt as a sign of the weakness of Tenrikyō headquarters (NSD 228-229).<sup>80</sup>

In his first *Osashizu* in July, Izō seems to imply that the manner in which the Tenrikyō leadership planned to settle the incident ought to establish a precedence to deal with similar situations in the future.<sup>81</sup> Subsequently Izō also maintained that all Tenrikyō branch churches (literally, *meishō*, or church names) were established with his permission and were under the authority of the Jiba (e.g. headquarters)<sup>82</sup> and explicitly dismissed the designation of Iwajirō’s residence as the Mizu-yashiki.<sup>83</sup>

While it took some time before leading adherents could stir up the resolve necessary to settle the matter according to Izō’s wishes, it ultimately came to the

---

<sup>78</sup> “Do not neglect to resolve this matter” (Os 4: 2717, Meiji 29 [1896] December 7 timely talk). “Watch over the situation closely. Discuss the matter amongst yourselves and firmly establish control over the situation in its entirety” (Os 4: 2788, Meiji 30 [1897] July 3). “This must quickly be brought under control. It will not do to delay it any further, or else nothing can be done.” (Os 4: 2792, Meiji 30 July 14).

<sup>79</sup> “Even in a difficult situation, it is the duty of an intermediary to deal with it. But everyone is uneasy and hesitant. There is no need for hesitancy in this world. [Each] instruction is divine protection in and of itself. There is no mistake in any of my instructions” (Os 4: 2773, Meiji 30 [1897] June 3).

<sup>80</sup> There are accounts that have Masui Isaburō being accompanied by Kita Jirōkichi (TJKH 562) and Masuno Shōbei (Os 4: 2787, Meiji 30 July 3). It is unclear whether they were a part of the same party or whether Masui made two separate trips to Heian Shikyōkai.

<sup>81</sup> “Sah, sah, the matter you inquire of, be sure to ponder deeply over it. Ponder this situation far into the future, be it twenty years or thirty years” (Os 4: 2787, Meiji 30 [1897] July 3).

<sup>82</sup> “I have bestowed a sign onto various provinces and places that are called Tenri churches” (Os 4: 2791, Meiji 30 [1897] July 14). “Where do you think the permission to establish church names comes from? You will understand once you discern this” (Os 4: 2798, Meiji 30 [1897] August 2).

<sup>83</sup> “[His residence] was never known as the Mizu-yashiki” (*ibid.*).

point where Iwajirō's behavior could no longer be tolerated. Izō's culminating instruction in November ("As the situation regarding Iida Iwajirō has gradually grown worse, we wish to know how to discipline him [for his actions]") reads as follows:

By failing to accept my previous instructions one after another, you allowed a faith of many years to come to naught. When the mistaken belief was not deeply entrenched, [Iwajirō's ways] would have been corrected if you had corrected them. But because you allowed many days to pass, people have become attached to the mistaken doctrine and to each other [in the process]. As they became more attached, all the more their sincerity was lost. That is why I had advised you to correct his ways, before the situation [could deteriorate this far]. Because the matter was neglected, all the sincere devotion [Iwajirō] accumulated until now [will come to naught], like digging up the seeds before they are allowed to grow.

If there are two or three places [claimed to be the source of salvation], the Residence of Origin would have no reason to exist. [Now we find here and there those who insist that their church is the source of salvation.] They attempt such things because they do not understand the origin. There are churches in various districts, but they are all derived from the Jiba of Origin. If this truth of the Jiba is neglected, even with great effort no churches can be maintained...

...When evil is allowed to thrive, it often thrives temporarily [with great vigor]. It will not do to neglect it [until it becomes uncontrollable].

In the world there are still very few who understand the truth of the teachings. If you had taken care of this matter earlier, we would not be where we are today.

Men are apt to be driven by greed. Greed invites one person after another into a serious situation. Now you have no other effective means to deal with those who do not understand the truth of the teaching. It is too late. As of today it is important to completely settle the matter once and for all (Os 4: 2835-2836, Meiji 30 [1897] November 13; Serizawa S. 148-149; Yamamoto and Nakajima 1: 441-444).

The November 13 *Osashizu* for the most part sums up the attitude Izō upheld throughout the Mizu-yashiki incident. Izō does not only blame Iwajirō for his

‘greed,’ but also chastises the Tenrikyō leadership for allowing the situation to worsen until it required the drastic measure of expelling Iwajirō and his members from the Tenrikyō organization. Again, Izō further emphasizes the orthodoxy of the Jiba as the source of salvation and that all Tenrikyō branch churches ‘derived’ their salvational and institutional power from church headquarters.

### Implications of the Mizu-yashiki jiken

As a result Izō’s directions from November 13, 1897, Iwajirō was stripped of his title as a religious instructor (*kyōdōshoku*) on the 17th and was dismissed from the head minister position of Heian Shikyōkai on the 18th. Also on the 18th, ministers Ueda Zenbei and Haruki Ikuzō who cooperated with Iwajirō, had their instructor titles revoked. On the 25th, Izō authorized the request to install Itakura Tsuchisaburō as the interim head minister of Heian and relocate the shikyōkai away from the Mizu-yashiki. Izō also stated his wish for the party scheduled to take part in the relocation ceremony to avoid any open conflict with Mizu-yashiki members.<sup>84</sup>

On December 1, Itakura, the new head minister of Heian, headed to Ando Village with Matsumura Kichitarō, Hirano Narazō, and fifteen others to conduct the relocation ceremony of Heian Shikyōkai that would remove the *bunshin* (divided spirit) of Tenri-Ō-no-Mikoto as an object of worship from the Mizu-yashiki. However, there was a practical issue that required special attention. Iwajirō had installed a large lock on the portals of the wooden altar (*yashiro*) at

---

<sup>84</sup> “I permit [the relocation] according to your petition. The kami will promptly relocate according to your petition. No matter how much a commotion [the Mizu-yashiki followers] may cause, refrain from provoking a situation at all costs” (Os 4: 2842, Meiji 30 November 25).

his church, which made it impossible to remove the *shintai* without destroying the altar itself. The Tenrikyō officials made the decision to take a gohei from headquarters into which the *shintai* could be ritually transferred (TKSS 485). Tenrikyō headquarters notified Mizu-yashiki members of the ceremony beforehand, and they awaited the party from Jiba with bamboo spears and hoes. A threatening atmosphere pervaded as the party arrived and former Heian yaku-in Matsuo Yozō and Mizu-yashiki minister Haruki both wished to avoid bloodshed.

Matsumura took the lead in the relocation ceremony, placing a gohei in front of the sacred mirror dedicated to God the Parent and uttered a prayer. Itakura did likewise at the sacred mirror dedicated to Miki and collected the gohei in a *karabitsu* 唐櫃 chest. Once the ceremony was over, the party exited the church under the intense glare of the Mizu-yashiki members as they walked away. Suddenly, a Mizu-yashiki follower, eyeing the *karabitsu*, lunged for it. Itakura stopped and pushed the person aside. The person's head hit a wall, causing him to fall to the ground. In response, the Mizu-yashiki members prepared to attack with their spears. However, the "dignified composure" of the party from headquarters and the efforts of Haruki and other Mizu-yashiki ministers prevented the situation from escalating (TJKH 563). Presently Daidōkyō seems to corroborate this account as an unfortunate outcome, attributing the action to the follower's over-enthusiasm. According to another Tenrikyō source, the fallout at the relocation ceremony of Heian Shikyōkai became a bloody skirmish, with many blows exchanged that left church lanterns and flags in tatters (TTDS 212). However, there is good reason to believe the account is an overexaggeration.

The party from headquarters then left for nearby Tatsuta Village and enshrined the divided spirit of Tenri-Ō-no-Mikoto on the second floor of the former Sumiya inn. The enshrinement ceremony was completed past 9:30 at night. While Tenrikyō headquarters settled the Mizu-yashiki jiken in this matter, the damage was already done. Of Heian Shikyōkai's one hundred fourteen religious instructors (*kyōshi*), only sixteen stayed with Tenrikyō. And from the approximately one thousand five hundred member households, only about thirty remained with Heian (TJKH 563). This loss in membership included Heian's branch confraternities and mission outposts (*shucchōsho*, *fukyōsho*) in Mie and Wakayama, which were subsequently transferred under the supervision of other Tenrikyō branch churches over the next several years.

While Heian Shikyōkai eventually recovered under the tenure of its third head minister Matsuo Yozō, Heian presently remains one of the smaller grand churches with fifty-seven branches. The Mizu-yashiki jiken also involved members from other Tenrikyō churches. Usa Shikyōkai in Oita lost a number of yaku-in who subsequently formed branches (*fukyōsho*) of the Mizu-yashiki. Nishi Shikyōkai in Osaka lost three important followers to Iwajirō's movement. The official history of Nishi Shikyōkai characterize these members as being disgruntled from the time Takada Kunisaburō was appointed as the head of the Shinjingumi kō (precursor of Nishi Shikyōkai) in 1887. According to Nishi sources, the three future defectors considered Takada an overambitious upstart who joined in 1882 while they were members since the founding of the Shinjingumi in 1879 (TJKH 480). The disgruntled threesome formed their own kō in another area of Osaka in 1890 and Iwajirō's schism appears to have taken advantage of the cleavage within this particular branch church.

Kita Bunkiyōkai was possibly the only 'mega-church' (138 branch churches in 1897) that was deeply affected by the Mizu-yashiki jiken. One of Iwajirō's closest confidants was Ueda Zenbei, a director of Kita Bunkiyōkai and the founding minister of Kōjimachi Shikyōkai in Tokyo. Ueda Zenbei's dismissal from his position, combined with the aggressive campaign Chūō Shinbun enacted against Tenrikyō in the capital led to the dispersion of over two thousand followers (*ibid.* 228). Ministers of Kita Bunkiyōkai requested Izō's advice on how to address the matter of Iwajirō's teachings infiltrating their branch churches, which they discovered upon conducting an inspection within their ranks (Os 4: 2843-2845, Meiji 30 [1897] November 27). In all, over thirty ministers of Kita Bunkiyōkai were dismissed from their positions with their religious instructor's licenses revoked. Tagawa Torakichi, head minister of Ikuno Shikyōkai (one of Kita's branches with eleven branches of its own in 1897), took on the responsibility of visiting Kita's branch churches throughout Shiga, Hyogo, and Okayama prefectures over the next seven years to reverse the damage caused by the Mizu-yashiki jiken (TJKH 68).

In the years following the Mizu-yashiki and Maehashi incidents, the Tenrikyō organization continued on its course toward institutionalization. In March 1898 Izō conveyed the divine intention of encouraging the creation of the Women's Association (Os 4: 2914, Meiji 31 [1898] March 25), and in June of the same year the foundations were also laid for the future Young Men's Association. These two developments represented a motion to improve the process for upcoming generations to be properly socialized in the faith together with new converts. Furthermore, Izō granted his approval of the establishment of the Tenri Seminary (Tenri Kyōkō 教校) in an effort to take the first step toward being recognized as an independent Shintō sect. (Tenrikyō's independence drive

to remove itself from the supervision of the Shintō Honkyoku will be discussed in detail in the next chapter.) Lastly, in May 1898, Izō also called for the standardization of the content of the Besseki lectures. Concerned over the growing tendency of intermediaries in charge of giving the lectures presenting too many different versions of the Besseki, Izō instructed Tenrikyō officials to create an official Besseki text to be used by all the lecturers. This move sought to discourage lecturers from spontaneous sermonizing and clearly represents a routinization of the system that helped initiate new converts in Tenrikyō doctrine. Izō gave Nakayama Shinnosuke the final authority of overseeing the drafts of this text, known today as the *Besseki daihon*. The fact that Izō asked for a red kimono to wear before giving these instructions lent an unprecedented air of legitimacy to the process (*ibid.* 4: 2962; 2971, Meiji [1898] May 9). It should be noted that beginning in late 1874, Nakayama Miki exclusively wore red clothing, from her kimono, sash, undergarments, down to her *tabi* socks to display her divine nature, that “Tsuki-Hi [dwelt] within” (Of VI: 6).<sup>85</sup>

Meanwhile, because Iwajirō lost his legal protection once he was dismissed as a Tenrikyō minister, he became a religious instructor of Taiseikyō in 1899. In March 1900, he established the Daidō Kyōkai, a subset of Taiseikyō until 1946. In this way Iwajirō sought legal sanction with Taiseikyō, which functioned as safe haven for Renmonkyō, various Shingaku groups, and Ontake confraternities (Inoue N. 2002). With confraternities in the Kinki, Chugoku, and Kyushu regions, Daidōkyō membership numbered in the hundreds of thousands

---

<sup>85</sup> These red garments were later cut up to create the amulets known as the *shōko-mamori*, which are still distributed today. Presently red cloth is offered to Miki at her sanctuary and ritually ‘worn’ by the everliving Miki. The above *Osashizu* is only one of two instances that I am aware of during which Izō wore red clothing.



at its peak in the 1900s and currently claims a little over a thousand followers (SJ 742; SKJJ 182-184).

### Chapter conclusion

As Iburi Izō inherited the charismatic authority to supervise the direction of the emerging Tenrikyō institution, he further emphasized Nakayama Miki's doctrine of the Jiba as the source of salvation that could not be duplicated by any other location. This certainly reflects the lesson that was established in Miki's treatment of Imai Sukezō's *honji suijaku* claim in which Izō rendered his assistance. Izō allowed branch churches to be established only after the Jiba was legally recognized by the state as the headquarters of the nascent Tenrikyō organization. He also refused to permit branch churches to perform the Kagura Zutome, Tenrikyō's central soteriological rite, limiting its performance at the Jiba headquarters.

Though Izō based his authority on the grant Miki bestowed upon him in 1875 that allowed him to enter a kamigakari state at will, he could never claim the same amount of supernatural power Miki exhibited in her physical lifetime. In other words, Izō could only claim to be a transmitter of the divine will of Miki's kami and not a miracle worker like she was. Izō maintained that the Sazuke grants he bestowed upon Tenrikyō missionaries were gifts from Miki that was made available through his mediation. He also attributed the miraculous healings attained by Sazuke prayers, sacred water and food (*goku*) to the divine power of the 'everliving' Foundress. Nevertheless, Izō used his position to dismiss Iwajirō's claims and make him an example of what would happen if a Tenrikyō minister utilized the Sazuke for his or her self-aggrandizement in that

they would lose the ability to channel Miki's divine power (Os 4: 2773, Meiji 30 [1897] June 3).

There is reasonable evidence suggesting that current Tenrikyō accounts on the Mizu-yashiki were written to protect the interests of the institution. In most accounts today, Iwajirō is undeniably characterized as a heretic who asserted the Jiba was the Residence of Fire, bested by the Mizu-yashiki where he planned to reestablish Tenrikyō headquarters—an obvious violation of Tenrikyō's self-defined orthodoxy. Considering this, it is notable that of all the changes Tenrikyō adopted under the pressure of the state as a result of the Secret Directives, the lone change that has yet to be rectified to this day is the return of the use of *mamori-fuda* as symbols of worship. By veiling the nature of the arguments Iwajirō utilized to openly criticize headquarters' policy, the Tenrikyō leadership has been able to avoid what potentially could be a highly controversial and contentious issue that may still resonate today. On the other hand, considering that most Tenrikyō followers do not seem to be aware of what the *shintai* of Tenrikyō branch churches are, the issue that was really at stake for Iwajirō in the Mizu-yashiki jiken could instead be met with cool indifference.<sup>86</sup> In either case, the present account promulgated in Tenrikyō histories is a far more effective strategy that helps define Iwajirō's position in the tradition as a heretic and a false prophet.

Yet it should also be noted that Iwajirō's claims that the kami rejected the adoption of sacred mirrors as the *shintai* enshrined at Tenrikyō branch churches did not elicit Izō's concern. The *Osashizu* are completely silent on the topic of the theological claim that favored a new object of worship. (While it is possible to

---

<sup>86</sup> The *shintai* (known as *medo* 目標 in Tenrikyō churches) enshrined in altars dedicated to Tenri-Ō-no-Mikoto is a mirror and that enshrined in altars dedicated to Miki is a gohei (TJ 355).

suggest that all mention of Iwajirō's *shintai* were edited out the *Osashizu*, it is a proposition that would be extremely difficult to confirm.) Izō's rhetoric recorded in the *Osashizu* reveals he took issue with Iwajirō's assertions that the Jiba would be abandoned by the kami for the Mizu-yashiki. Iwajirō's theological claims that a new path of salvation would be opened at the Mizu-yashiki challenged the direction of the Tenrikyō organization that sought to centralize its authority over its branch churches. In this incident, which pitted two charismatics against one another, Iwajirō ultimately stood no chance of advancing his agenda as long as Izō remained the recognized charismatic leader of the organization. The disagreement between the two prophets culminated into the relocation ceremony of Heian Shikyōkai away from Iwajirō's residence. The ceremony in which Tenrikyō considers to have conclusively resolved the incident illustrates the hierarchy of soteriological power held by the Jiba over its branch churches. The position of the Jiba can never be transferred to another location while a branch church, which is ultimately just a 'name' (*meishō*), can be relocated when exigency requires. Although Izō claimed that the churches established with permission from Jiba would last for countless generations, there lies the implication that his statement will be true on the condition that ministers and members of these branch churches maintain their devotion to the Jiba and Tenrikyō headquarters. Also, the decision by Iburi Izō and the Tenrikyō establishment to expel Iwajirō from its ranks reveals a clear example how "religious movements founded on revelations will soon attempt to curtail revelation or at least prevent novel (heretical) revelations" to retain authoritative control (Stark 1996, 139). Ultimately, the phenomenon of uninterrupted revelation would disappear altogether from Tenrikyō, leading to schismatic developments that will be discussed in the following chapter.

— Chapter Three —  
'Opening of the Lid':  
The Emergence of Tenri Kenkyūkai

Events leading to the founding of the Tenri Kenkyūkai (Tenri Study Association), the forerunner of Honmichi, in 1925 help illuminate several issues in the study of new religious movements (NRMs) in modern Japan. First, although the Tenrikyō establishment maintained that the death of Iburi Izō in 1907 marked the end of the age of revelation, there still was a significant sector within the movement that expected its return. The Tenri Kenkyūkai was the most aggressive example of the few emerging schismatic movements in the Taishō and early Shōwa periods that took advantage of this expectation. Second, steps taken by Tenrikyō to align its theology with State Shintō exacerbated the division between the institution and Ōnishi Aijirō's nascent movement. Certainly, the role of the state in accelerating Tenrikyō's efforts to "make peace with the world" must be considered a factor that enabled the Tenri Kenkyūkai to attract a significant following with its antiestablishment bent.

Shimazono Susumu has suggested Honmichi inherited and transformed Miki's 'amorphous' millenarian eschatology into a systematic millenarianism and messianism that has been largely absent in Japan (1986). Murakami Shigeyoshi has claimed that Honmichi is especially significant in Japanese history because it represented the rare instance of an indigenously inspired doctrine that refuted the legitimacy of the *tennōsei* (emperor system) set in motion by the Meiji Restoration (1974, 3).<sup>87</sup> In 1928 the Tenri Kenkyūkai

---

<sup>87</sup> Tsushima Michihito and Tenrikyō theologian Iida Teruaki have suggested that Aijirō and his movement did not reject *tennōsei* per se, but only the rule of the imperial family (See Tsushima 81-82 and Iida 289).

distributed its canonical document, the *Kenkyū Shiryō* ('Study Materials'), to prominent individuals, police stations, government agencies, and prefectural offices across the nation. Its contents contained this shocking statement:

The central pillar of Japan at this moment is an outsider (*tōjin*). An outsider... to put it simply, is a person lacking heavenly virtue (*tentoku*)... an unqualified individual who, out of his misunderstanding and ignorance, used the ancient myths as the basis of his own authority (NSSS 115).

In response to this blasphemous declaration against the Shōwa emperor, police from Nara, Osaka, and Kyoto prefectures stormed Tenri Kenkyūkai facilities. Though its occupants did not offer any active resistance, a number of leading followers were beaten and dragged off to prison. The remainder found themselves placed under house arrest. The hideout of the leader of the organization, former Tenrikyō missionary Ōnishi Aijirō, was tracked down and surrounded by more than thirty armed police. They had prepared themselves for the worse since Aijirō was accompanied by two of his adherents who happened to be retired naval officers. Contrary to the expectations of a violent standoff held by the police, Aijirō came out to greet them and allowed himself to be escorted away. Aijirō and one hundred seventy-nine of his closest adherents were subsequently charged with *lèse-majesté* for distributing their blasphemous literature. The event (the Tenri Kenkyūkai *fukei jiken* or *lèse-majesté* incident) was sensationally reported in the state-sponsored press and was comparable to the government's crackdown of two other NRMs, Ōmotokyō in 1921 and 1935; Hitonomichi in 1937.

While the Tenrikyō leadership did its best to distance itself from the Tenri Kenkyūkai from the moment they expelled Aijirō as a heretic due his self-proclamations to be the new prophet of Tenrikyō, there was no getting around

the reality that the dissenting group was directly inspired by the writings of Nakayama Miki and the recorded sayings of her charismatic successor Iburi Izō. Tenrikyō's legal status as an independent Kyōha Shintō sect—achieved following many years of failed petitions and numerous compromises with State Shintō—remained precarious at best while these scriptures still existed. This is evidenced by the fact that the above inflammatory statement from the *Kenkyū Shiryō* is Aijirō's own elaboration of the meaning of two verses from the *Ofudesaki*.<sup>88</sup>

My objective in this chapter is to make an inquiry into the factors that contributed to the defection of several thousands of Tenrikyō members to join Aijirō's movement. Following a short history on the efforts of the Tenrikyō institution to be recognized as an independent Kyōha Shintō sect and a description of Ōnishi Aijirō's early life until the founding of the Tenri Kenkyūkai, I will present the writings of Masuno Kosetsu 増野鼓雪 (1890-1928), a one-time headmaster of the Tenrikyō Seminary and the personal histories of four Tenri Kenkyūkai converts in Umehara (1977) in hopes that they will help illuminate a few of these factors. While there are a number of issues that need to be taken into account, I wish to suggest that the existence of two competing belief systems that surrounded the issue of revelation especially provided a ripe context for schism to occur. While the establishment claimed that Izō's death ended the period of revelation in Tenrikyō, there was a widespread expectation of the

---

<sup>88</sup> The two verses are: "Those of *Kara* (*tōjin*) have entered *Nihon* and their willful acts cause the anger of God. The central pillar of the high mountains is that of *tōjin*. This is the prime cause of the anger of God" (Of II: 32 and III: 57). The meaning of *Nihon*, together with *Kara* and *tōjin* (唐・唐人), are presently described in Tenrikyō as "the components of a geographical metaphor that expresses the distance between the intention of God the Parent and a person's understanding of it" (Of 480). While Tenrikyō theologian Inoue Akio is known to have translated *Nihon* as the 'initiated' and *Kara* as the 'uninitiated' (Inoue and Eynon 9), I have chosen to translate *tōjin* as 'outsider.'

return of revelation among Tenrikyō followers. Because Tenrikyō was entering its postcharismatic phase at the time of Aijirō's revelatory experience, his claim to be the source of new revelation (*tenkeisha*) resonated with those who sought to be unburdened from the Tenrikyō establishment that they considered to be too accommodating with the ideology of State Shintō. As the Tenrikyō institution eliminated the charismatic office of Honseki in favor of the hereditary office of the Shinbashira, a significant number of Tenrikyō adherents flocked to Aijirō's revelation—though subject to severe oppression by the state—that provided these adherents a greater source of emotional appeal.

### **The drive toward sectarian independence**

In the last chapter it was described how the Home Ministry responded to Tenrikyō's explosive growth by issuing a directive in 1896 to force various changes in its doctrine and rituals. When Inaba Shōzen took over as the kanchō (administrative head) of the Shintō Honkyoku in 1899, he encouraged the Tenrikyō leadership to apply to the Home Ministry to be recognized as an independent religious organization due to the fundamental differences between the doctrines of two religions (NSD 255-256).

Thus Tenrikyō's 'drive for sectarian independence' (*ippa dokuritsu undō*) began in earnest from 1899 and its first petition was sent to the Home Ministry with a letter of support from the Shintō Honkyoku. Though Konkōkyō, which also made a bid for independence about the same time, received permission to become an independent Kyōha Shintō organization in 1900, Tenrikyō's application was resoundingly rejected. Officials from the Home Ministry stated

that the doctrines and level of Tenrikyō's institutional organization did not sufficiently meet their guidelines for acceptance.

Tenrikyō officials subsequently employed the service of individuals outside the movement who were familiar with its teachings to assist in its drive for sectarian independence. These individuals included: nativist scholars (*kokugakusha*) Inoue Yorikuni and Henmi Nakasaburō, who drafted a comprehensive outline of Tenrikyō doctrine; Nakanishi Ushio, a scholar of religion who helped write a commentary on the *Mikagura-uta* and fleshed out in writing a variety of theological issues; and Udagawa Bunkai 宇田川文海, a former writer for several Osaka newspapers, was assigned to edit the periodical *Michi no tomo*.<sup>89</sup>

Izō authorized a number of compromises to Miki's teachings over the next several years as Tenrikyō petitioned repeatedly to the Home Ministry in order to attain its independence from the Shintō Honkyoku. 1903 saw the creation of a canonical document (the so-called *Meiji Kyōten*) that fully aligned Tenrikyō theology with the ideology of State Shintō. A look at the titles of the chapters—"Honoring the Kami" (*keishin*), "Revering the Emperor" (*sonnō*), "Patriotism" (*aikoku*), "Ethical Principles" (*meirin*), "Cultivating Virtue" (*shūtoku* 脩徳), "Purification" (*futsujo* 祓除), "The Founding of the Faith" (*rikkyō*), "The Benevolence of the Kami" (*shin'on*), "The Kagura," "Peace of Mind" (*anshin*)—reveal a degree of incongruence between Miki's original teachings and the Meiji Kyōten. To give a few specific examples, the Meiji Kyōten was required to contain a chapter on emperor worship—a discourse that was completely

---

<sup>89</sup> Before becoming a newspaper reporter and a novelist, Udagawa was a Buddhist priest laicized during *haibutsu kishaku* (Ōya 35-36). Unlike the three aforementioned individuals, he remained with Tenrikyō following the independence drive. Refer to Ōya (33-53) for information on his contributions.



absent from Miki's writings. In the chapter "Honoring the Kami," Tenrikyō was also forced to slightly alter or completely replace six of the names of its ten kami and render Miki's kana-written names into kanji to conform to the *Nihongi*.<sup>90</sup>

Although the Home Ministry approved the Meiji Kyōten during Tenrikyō's third petition for sectarian independence, the petition was eventually rejected for the reason that the contents of the new canon was not sufficiently disseminated among the Tenrikyō membership. This led to the composition of the ten verses of the Tenri Shōka, an official anthem of sorts where each verse was based on major themes from each chapter of the Meiji Kyōten.<sup>91</sup> The anthem was sung at events sponsored by Tenrikyō headquarters until the end of World War II when the Meiji Kyōten ceased to be the official canon of Tenrikyō. The anthem nevertheless gained a significant degree of popularity with Tenrikyō members (TJ 637).

While much effort was made to comply with Home Ministry guidelines, postwar Tenrikyō histories are quick to point out any compromises that were consciously made only affected the religion on a superficial level. For example, though the following quote specifically refers to Tenrikyō's compliance when faced by the Home Ministry Secret Directives in 1896, it nevertheless reflects the attitude of the Tenrikyō leadership during the drive toward sectarian independence as well.

---

<sup>90</sup> Two kami names were radically changed while four others were altered slightly:

<u>Kami according to the <i>Ofudesaki</i></u>	<u>As presented in the Meiji Kyōten</u>
Kunitokotachi-no-Mikoto	Kuninotokotachi-no-Mikoto
Omotari-no-Mikoto	Omotaru-no-Mikoto
Kunisazuchi-no-Mikoto	Kuninosatsuchi-no-Mikoto
Kumoyomi-no-Mikoto	Toyokumunu-no-Mikoto
Taishokuten-no-Mikoto	Ohirume-no-Mikoto
Otonobe-no-Mikoto	Otomabe-no-Mikoto

<sup>91</sup> The verse on "Patriotism" was the longest verse in the Tenri Shōka at ten lines, four lines longer than the length of the average verse. See NSD (301-307) for the lyrics of the Tenri Shōka and Ueda H. (2004g) for the content of the Meiji Kyōten.

[T]he Tenrikyo Church's conformity with state demands should not lead us to conclude that it transformed the whole Tenrikyo faith from top to bottom. Rather, it resulted in creating a dual structure of the faith within the Church. On the surface, Tenrikyo changed its "official" system of doctrine and ritual in a way that complied with state demands. This was Tenrikyo vis-a-vis the state. There existed, however, an undercurrent of faith among the followers that maintained the original teachings and rites as taught by Oyasama, disregarding the Church's "official" doctrine and ritual imposed by the state. Tenrikyo thus kept its own autonomous faith ready to be expressed when the time and conditions allowed (TOMD 1998, 61-62).

This "dual structure of faith" essentially was a double-faced character (*nimen-sei*) on the part of the Tenrikyō leadership. While the organization officially adopted a canon that supported the state ideology of the emperor as a divine ruler, Tenrikyō members secretly circulated and copied hand-written manuscripts of the *Ofudesaki* and numerous versions of the *Doroumi Kōki* amongst themselves which were essentially incompatible with *tennōsei* ideology (Aochi 1970, 212-213; 217). The incongruity between Miki's antiestablishment stance found in the *Ofudesaki* and the level of compromise the Tenrikyō institution was willing to accede to the state also became a potential source of cleavage and dissonance within the Tenrikyō faithful. While Tenrikyō was finally recognized as the last legal Kyōha Shintō organization in 1908 after nine years and five applications to the Home Ministry, these series of actions compromising with state demands damaged its reputation as the authoritative body that inherited Miki's routinized charisma and lessened the authority of headquarters in the eyes of a significant sector of its membership.<sup>92</sup>

---

<sup>92</sup> For more information on Tenrikyō's drive toward sectarian independence, refer to Arakitōryō Henshūbu 2002 (48-56), NSD (257-311; 353-366), TJ (44-47; 48-50) and Ueda Hirakazu's series in the periodical *Yōki* (2003e; 2004a; 2004c-h).

Hiroike Chikurō and Ōhira Ryōhei represented the most vocal sources of criticism and dissent directed against the Tenrikyō institution. Hiroike, a self-educated specialist on Chinese legislative history, joined Tenrikyō in 1909. In 1912 he resigned from his post as an instructor at Waseda University and the Jingū Kōgakkan (the precursor of Kōgakkan University) to become an educational advisor in the Tenrikyō organization and the honorary principal of Tenri Middle School. At Nakayama Shinnosuke's memorial service in early 1915, Hiroike used his condolence speech to express his dissent against Tenrikyō's subservience to the state in the presence of government and the Shintō Honkyoku representatives.

The late kanchō (Shinnosuke) and headquarters officials for many years struggled to achieve Tenrikyō's sectarian independence. However, in my eyes, this independence represented an independence in name only and was not a true spiritual independence [from Shintō]. The way to compensate for this is for us to follow the divine revelations, aim [to practice] the pure form of the teaching, renounce all worldliness, and revere the character and spirit of the late great kanchō. From now on, I believe we must learn from the Foundress' steps and unite, completely submitting ourselves to the authority of headquarters to assist in the major task of humankind's spiritual salvation (Arakitōryō Henshūbu 2003a).

Hiroike subsequently became alienated from the institution and formed the ethics organization known as Moralogy in 1926.

Ōhira Ryōhei joined Tenrikyō in July 1914 following his research into the religion that began about a year before. Ōhira initiated the monthly periodical *Shinshūkyō* in April 1915 and in an article entitled "*Tenrikyō kakumei no koe*" (a voice for revolution in Tenrikyō) demanded the reform of Tenrikyō headquarters, total independence from Shintō, and the abolishment of the Meiji

Kyōten. In 1916 Ōhira became involved with the schismatic movement headed by Ide Kuni 井手クニ, a self-proclaimed prophet who visited Tenrikyō headquarters and branch churches. She later became the founder of the Asahi Jinja and was revered as the 'Second Foundress' (*nidai no kyōso*) and 'Banshū no Oyasama' by her followers.<sup>93</sup>

### The early life of Ōnishi Aijirō

Aijirō was born the youngest child of Kishioka Kichijirō and Kisa on August 26, 1881 in Uda Village (present-day Utano Town, Nara Prefecture). Though the Kishiokas were once a prominent family in the area (Aijirō's grandfather Eijirō was employed as a *shōya*, a village headmaster), they fell into hard times following a series of misfortunes. Following the failure of his contracting business, Kishioka Kichijirō became embroiled in a series of lawsuits that lasted three years (Umehara 1978, 53). Yonekichi, Aijirō's elder brother who was adopted by the Matoba family, began to suffer from a serious psychological disorder<sup>94</sup> and had his marriage annulled. When Aijirō was seventeen, his eldest brother Sentarō succumbed to an eye disease and went blind at the age of twenty-five. In 1899, Aijirō's mother Kisa fell victim to a malignant tumor in her uterus.

In accordance with his mother's wishes for him to pursue a career in education, Aijirō was enrolled at the Nara-ken Shihan Gakkō (prefectural normal school) in Nara. Sentarō subsequently became a devoted Tenrikyō follower and encouraged Aijirō to also have faith. In the summer of 1900, Aijirō returned

---

<sup>93</sup> Refer to Toyoshima (118-127) for more information on Ide Kuni.

<sup>94</sup> This disorder has been variously suggested either to have been melancholia, hypochondria (HG 1; Murakami 1974, 149) or neurosis (Umehara 1975, 27).

home for the summer break and Kisa's condition grew worse. Once it was clear that Kisa was beyond medical help, Sentarō urged Aijirō that there was nothing left to do but depend on the intervention of the kami to cure their mother (Murakami 1974, 56). At night, Aijirō and Sentarō went to the Yoshino River to perform cold-water ablutions (*mizu-gori*) and prayed at to the local *ujigami* at the abandoned Hirai Jinja.

At one point, Kisa asked to be moved to the home of Yonekichi, who by this time established a branch (*bunke*) of the Kishioka family. One night, when Aijirō was unable to endure the sight of his mother suffering, ran outside to wash his hands in a nearby stream and prayed. He implored to the kami to ease his mother's pain for an hour. When Aijirō returned to Kisa's side, he found her sleeping peacefully. An hour later, the pain returned and Aijirō resumed his prayers. Kisa's pain continued to ebb and flow repeatedly for the rest of the night in accordance to Aijirō's prayers and this experience has been said to have motivated Aijirō to have faith in Tenrikyō (HG 5). Once Aijirō returned to Nara to resume his studies, he became a member of Tenrikyō Nara Shikyōkai.

Aijirō perceived that his family misfortunes resulted from negative *innen*, or karma, from past lives. To remedy this situation, Aijirō resolved to leave his studies to engage in *tandoku fukyō*, or solo missionary work within three days of receiving the Sazuke (*ibid.* 6). Over a period of nine months Aijirō attended the nine Besseki lectures at Tenrikyō headquarters and received the Sazuke from Iburi Izō on December 3, 1900. As a sign of his immense gratitude, Aijirō sold all his possessions and returned home penniless; he had donated the money to Tenrikyō headquarters and to Nara Shikyōkai (*ibid.* 7). Though Kisa had died during the time he waited to complete his Besseki lectures, Aijirō kept his pledge to devote himself to *tandoku fukyō*.

All biographical accounts portray Aijirō as a sincere and dedicated Tenrikyō missionary, and for reasons beyond his control, he could not live up to his potential as a successful minister. His years as a Tenrikyō missionary were filled with periods of destitution and starvation. According to Murakami Shigeyoshi, Kitade Zentarō, a fellow missionary who jealously viewed Aijirō as a rival, derailed Aijirō's proselytizing efforts in Gunma Prefecture. Aijirō had spent the last two and a half years accumulating a following who urged him to establish a church. Aijirō wrote a letter to inform his parent church, Nara Shikyōkai, of his plan to take five to six of his most devoted followers to Jiba. Zentarō utilized the recent change in the head minister position at Nara Shikyōkai to secretly forge a reply that directed Aijirō to put his trip on hold. The fact that the new head minister Rev. Haruno Ki'ichi favored Aijirō over Zentarō in a potential marriage proposal to marry into the affluent Ōnishi household as an adopted son seemed to have fanned his resentment (Murakami 1974, 73). Unaware of Zentarō's deception, Aijirō was completely bewildered at this unexpected setback and hastily canceled the pilgrimage trip to Jiba.

In January 1904, Aijirō accepted the aforementioned marriage proposal and married Ōnishi To'ō and was adopted as the head of the Ōnishi family. While Aijirō's followers in Gunma eagerly awaited for his return, Rev. Haruno again had other plans for the young missionary. He requested Aijirō to revitalize three missions in Yamaguchi Prefecture as they lacked a qualified minister to lead them. Aijirō accepted this task despite his hesitancy to end his mission in Gunma.

Upon his arrival in Yamaguchi, one of the missions, Yamaguchi Senkyōsho, was so laden with debts that Aijirō handed over its building and property to creditors. To'ō joined her husband in July 1904 and the next year the

couple sent for her mother Kosayo. As a sign of their hardened resolve to revive Tenrikyō in Yamaguchi, the Ōnishis sold their property and with the money raised made an anonymous donation to Tenrikyō headquarters and Nara Shikyōkai in January 1906 during Miki's twentieth nensai (death anniversary) (Umehara 1977, 66-67). When Aijirō was officially appointed as the head minister of Yamaguchi Senkyōsho in January 1907, the individual who had looked after the mission until that point became angered he was not made the head minister. This person expressed his discontent by spreading various malicious rumors about the Ōnishi family. Followers of the mission were reluctant to support the new minister, which caused the Ōnishis to fall deep into poverty.

In 1907, To'ō was with child and because she suffered from malnutrition, experienced an extremely difficult childbirth. She was in labor for three days until a follower provided the cash to buy arrowroot powder for a broth that enabled To'ō to regain her energy and give birth to Yoshinobu, their first son. The Yamaguchi followers then began to realize there was no basis for the rumors that were spread and gradually began to congregate the mission once again.

Since the majority of the followers in Yamaguchi lacked significant assets, Aijirō received very little financial support. On top of his responsibilities as head minister of the Yamaguchi Senkyōsho, beginning in November 1907, Aijirō was made an official of the Okayama (Chugoku region) diocese. However, the position was nothing more than an honorary post and did not provide a salary of any kind. It has been said that Aijirō was often forced to pawn many household items to cover his travel expenses that accompanied his new position and could not effectively concentrate on his ministry.

Aijirō and To'o were obligated to attend the monthly services of Nara Shikyōkai, their parent church. It was a standard procedure for Tenrikyō ministers to take their followers to worship at the monthly services of their parent churches, especially for the spring and autumn grand services in January and October. However, the financial situation in Yamaguchi did not allow Aijirō and To'o to have their followers to accompany them on these trips. Once arriving at Nara Shikyōkai, the Ōnishis were subject to overhearing others comparing the sizes of ministers' entourages. Aijirō and To'o also overheard fellow ministers criticizing them for living comfortably off the assets from their property. Of course, these ministers could not have known the Ōnishis had anonymously donated their assets to the church. Rev. Haruno and Rev. Hino Tokutarō, formerly staunch supporters of Aijirō, similarly had no idea of the Ōnishis' actual situation and could only listen to the criticism in silence. Shimazono Susumu has suggested that because Aijirō could not meet expectations placed on him to bring in new followers, he was increasingly alienated from his fellow ministers during this time (1986, 63).

*'Kanrodai nin no o-fumitome': Aijirō's revelatory experience*

Beginning in 1912, Aijirō was at a spiritual crossroads. Three of his followers were suffering from serious illnesses; one from Hansen's disease, one from consumption, and another from paralysis. Because Aijirō did not doubt the omnipotent power of the kami, he came to the conclusion that his prayers were ineffective because of a lack of sincerity on his part or that his heart was not sufficiently purified (HG 33). Thus in the spring of 1913, Aijirō secluded himself



in a six-tatami mat room away from Yamaguchi Senkyōsho and refused to see anyone in order to contemplate over the significance of these grave illnesses.

The Ōnishis increasingly became impoverished as Aijirō's refusal to see his followers caused them to withdraw their devotion and support. By this time the Ōnishis were a family of six, as To'o gave birth to Aiko in January 1910 and Masanori in December 1912. In his contemplation Aijirō neglected his offspring, who were so malnourished that they no longer had the energy to play with the neighborhood children and could only lie around on the tatami floor.

In late July 1913 Aijirō began to feel a sharp pain in his chest and the sensation of icy cold water dripping on his head. Surprised, Aijirō examined the top of his head with his fingers, yet strangely felt no moisture. Remembering a verse from the *Ofudesaki*, Aijirō believed Tsuki-Hi was attempting to communicate with him.<sup>95</sup> Then on the fifteenth of the seventh lunar month, Aijirō began to perceive everything he saw, including the clothes he was wearing, as indescribably filthy. Aijirō called his wife to bring their children to the six-mat room. Aijirō stripped naked and bade his wife and children do the same. Aijirō and To'o each carried one of their children on their backs<sup>96</sup> and repeatedly circled the room in a counterclockwise direction.

[Aijirō] was not aware of his movements. It was as if he was being pulled by a fearsome and shadowy force; or what can be described as an irresistible power. He kept walking unconsciously in a circle from the early evening to the middle of the night. Suddenly, he came to a halt. He then walked to the center of the room and thought to himself, "This is where the Kanrodai stands." (HG 37).

---

<sup>95</sup> "If a severe tightening of the chest comes upon you (*munasaki e kibishiku tsukae kitaru nara*), it is the hastening of the mind of Tsuki-Hi" (Of XI: 1).

<sup>96</sup> According to Umehara Masaki, Aijirō carried Masanori and To'o carried Aiko (1975, 89).

Aijirō was initially puzzled, knowing fully well there could not be another Kanrodai (Stand of Heavenly Dew) that marked the Jiba, in Yamaguchi Prefecture. As stated in the Introduction, in Tenrikyō, the Jiba was and still is regarded as the place where the first human beings were first conceived in Tenrikyō's cosmogony. Aijirō came to realize that this new revelation did not refer to the geographic Kanrodai, but a human one. When he began to doubt that a person with deeply negative inner such as himself could share the sacredness of the Kanrodai at the Jiba where Tenrikyō devotees prayed each morning and evening, Aijirō felt another sharp pain in his chest. Once he quickly apologized to Tsuki-Hi for doubting this sudden revelation, the pain cleared instantly (*ibid.* 38). From that day onward Aijirō considered himself the 'human Kanrodai,' the new revelator (*tenkeisha*) of Tenrikyō. This event is known in Honmichi today as the "*Kanrodai nin no o-fumitome*" (the establishment of the human Kanrodai) and is annually celebrated each August 15.

Over the next month, Aijirō studied Tenrikyō scriptures for doctrinal support of this revelation and developed the core of Honmichi's teachings. Through his new status as *tenkeisha*, Aijirō is considered to have had the ability to decipher hidden prophecies found in Tenrikyō scriptures, the *Ofudesaki*, *Osashizu*, and the *Doroumi Kōki*. The revealing of these prophecies is known today as *futa-ake*, literally, 'opening of the lid.' Aijirō notified Tenrikyō headquarters and leading branch churches of these prophecies that predicted the arrival of a human Kanrodai and urged they accept him as the new charismatic authority of Tenrikyō. Needless to say, Tenrikyō headquarters considered Aijirō's scriptural interpretations as heretical. Aijirō's innovative doctrine of a biological Kanrodai was a theologically loaded assertion that could not be accepted by church authority. While there is not enough room here to discuss

Aijirō's interpretations in detail,<sup>97</sup> his letters to church headquarters were completely ignored as Nakayama Shinnosuke was firmly in place as the administrative head of Tenrikyō by this time. Aijirō especially wanted to hold Shinnosuke accountable for his promise to Izō to purchase 'a large tree' (Os 6: 4604-4605, Meiji 39 [1906] May 28). While Tenrikyō considers the promise as being tied to purchasing lumber for a construction project (the building of the current North Worship Hall that is now known as the 'Taishō construction'), Aijirō considered the 'large tree' symbolized the appearance of a new revelator.

Ōnishi continued to send letters and inspired *tanka* to Tenrikyō headquarters and major branch churches each month for the next nine years (HG 55-56). These actions quickly worsened Aijirō's standing in the Nara Shikyōkai and led to his dismissal as head minister of Yamaguchi Senkyōsho in January 1914. Aijirō was not only viewed with disdain by his followers but by town shopkeepers and landlords in Yamaguchi as well as he had accumulated an enormous debt. Having run out of opportunities, he decided to move back to his home prefecture of Nara. In a months' time Aijirō and his family slowly made their way by foot to Onomichi of Hiroshima Prefecture where sympathetic officials (*yaku-in*) of a local Tenrikyō mission allowed them to stay for the night and provided the Ōnishis with tickets for a ferry to Osaka. Along the way, Aijirō stopped by a few grand churches and was met with hostility when he attempted to expound his newfound understanding of the Tenrikyō doctrine. Aijirō's brother Kishioka Sentarō similarly expressed his fury when Aijirō began to explain the doctrine of the human Kanrodai (Umehara 1975, 114-118). Once reaching his mother's hometown in Nara Prefecture, Aijirō slowly began to make

---

<sup>97</sup> For a summary of Honmichi's interpretations of other key scriptures, refer to Umehara (1977, 92-109).

a new start with his family. He initially found work at a temporary hospital that was set up to care for patients during outbreaks of typhoid fever in 1917 and influenza in 1918. He later worked at an understaffed tax office, which took a toll on his health. Unable to physically keep up, Aijirō resigned and found work as an elementary school instructor.

Aijirō viewed Shinnosuke's sudden death in late 1914 as a sign that the Shinbashira had become expendable (*yobun*) with the transfer of the charismatic mantle into his hands as the human Kanrodai. In 1916 To'o became pregnant with their fourth child. Through a dream, Aijirō became convinced the child was the reincarnation (*saisei*) of Nakayama Miki. He also based this belief on a passage of the 1881 poetic version of the *Doroumi Kōki* cosmogony.<sup>98</sup> Aijirō quickly sent an announcement to Tenrikyō headquarters that Miki was to be reborn soon. A number of followers who overheard this ridiculed the idea and laughed as they wondered what would Aijirō do if To'o gave birth to a boy, which would lay waste to his claim. Others in the surrounding area were overjoyed at the announcement and wondered if they should cook *sekihan* (red bean rice) to celebrate the occasion (Umehara 1977, 124). When To'o gave birth to a daughter on the twenty-fourth of the tenth lunar month, the very same date when Miki experienced her kamigakari in 1838, Aijirō became ever more convinced that the soul of the child was that of Miki's and named her Tama.

---

<sup>98</sup> "Thirty years from this year Tama-hime will be [drawn back] to the primary residence" (DK verse 30). Aijirō saw this verse as having two meanings. "This year" (*kotoshi*) could both be interpreted as 1881 (the year the verse was written) and 1887 (the year of Nakayama Miki's death). According to Aijirō this verse both foretold the rebirth of Kōkan as Aiko in 1910, and Miki as Tama in 1916 at the 'primary residence' (*moto no yashiki*) or the family of the new 'source' (*moto*) of revelation, i.e., Ōnishi Aijirō (Umehara 1975, 119-121).

### The founding of the Tenri Kenkyūkai

In June 1920 Aijirō attracted his first follower, Tsutsumi Torakichi, a yaku-in of Biwa Shikyōkai who had read his letters. Aijirō gradually began to attract poor Tenrikyō church ministers and yaku-in on a regular basis beginning in 1923. Aijirō continued to work as an elementary school teacher by day and instructed his growing group of adherents at night. In August of that year, he sent his nephew Koura Yoshio along with three others to the Tenrikyō headquarters to visit the homes of various officials of church headquarters (*honbu-in*) as an attempt to negotiate with Tenrikyō's core leadership to accept Aijirō's authority (Murakami 1974, 128). By the end of the month, however, it became increasingly clear that the negotiations were going nowhere and Aijirō called them off. Despite the delegation's failure to convince the Tenrikyō leadership of the legitimacy of Aijirō's claims, news of the event created quite a stir throughout the institution.

Officials at Tenrikyō headquarters were no longer in a position to ignore Aijirō's activities and revoked his religious instructors' license on February 2, 1924. So from this moment, Aijirō's religious activities were subject to censure by law enforcement officials. Later that year, in response to the earnest requests of his following, Aijirō resigned from his job to concentrate on his religious activities. Aijirō continued to attract personages that would make important contributions in the near future. One was Suzuki Daizō, who provided Aijirō with financial support and made the first steps in establishing a missionary presence in Nagoya. Another was Nakai Ginjirō, a retired naval commander and former yaku-in of Nishijin Bunkiyōkai who later helped Aijirō compile the *Kenkyū Shiryō*, the document that led to the first *lèse-majesté* incident.

In January 1925, Aijirō named his faith organization the Tenri Kenkyūkai, or the ‘Tenri Study Association’ with the hope of promoting the study of Tenrikyō scriptures, an activity that he felt had been neglected for far too long. The Tenri Kenkyūkai were especially focused on the study of specific passages from the *Osashizu* which were known as the ‘One Hundred Days Osashizu’ (*hyakunichi no osashizu*) and the ‘Osashizu of the Three Houses’ (*mimune no osashizu*).<sup>99</sup> It should be noted that Tenrikyō today does not recognize the ‘Osashizu of the Three Houses’ as a series of revelations deserving a separate category but considers them an inseparable part of the ‘One Hundred Days Osashizu.’ According to the Tenrikyō orthodox interpretation, the ‘three houses’ (*sanken mimune* 三軒三棟) refer to the families of Iburi Izō’s three children Nagao Yoshie, Iburi Masae, and Iburi Masajin. The Honmichi interpretation considers the ‘three houses’ to be the families of the three revelators Miki, Izō, and Aijirō.

An increase of live-in followers led to the construction of several facilities—a main hall, lecture hall, and kitchen—in Takenouchi, an area near the Nara-Osaka border (present-day Taima-chō). In the lecture hall Aijirō gave sermons called ‘*oseki*’ that explained his interpretations of Tenrikyō scriptures. Later, two large wooden buildings that would become the Tenri Kenkyūjo were constructed and was nicknamed the ‘red-roofed palace’ (*Akayane goden*) by neighboring villagers. The roof tiles of the buildings were painted red to symbolize the rising sun and the ever-increasing vitality of the new movement, which had reached more than four thousand adherents by this time (Umehara 1975, 136).

---

<sup>99</sup> The ‘One Hundred Days Osashizu’ are named so due to the fact that Izō had said, “I will deliver ten years of instructions in one hundred days” (Os 6: 4723, Meiji 40 [1907] June 5).

Through founding the Tenri Kenkyūkai, Aijirō simply wished to restore Tenrikyō as a religion with ongoing revelation by disseminating the results of their ‘study’ of key scriptures. While it was not his intention for the Tenri Kenkyūkai to become a rival organization to Tenrikyō (*ibid.* 129; HG 70), officials from the latter felt otherwise. Tenrikyō headquarters and branch churches publicly denied any association with Aijirō’s movement and dismissed ministers or followers who were known to have set foot in Takenouchi.

**Tenrikyō in transition:  
the passing of Iburi Izō and Nakayama Shinnosuke**

The task of bestowing the Sazuke was inherited by Ueda Naraito in June 1907 three days before Izō’s death. Izō’s last words were reputedly to be, “How thankful, what a delicious meal” (*ōkini, gochisō-san*) and he died sitting up with his hands on his lap. Following Nakayama Shinnosuke’s death on December 31, 1914, the position of kanchō was filled by the son of Shinnosuke and Tamae, Shōzen in January 1915, who was only eleven years of age. His uncle Yamazawa Tamezō, a Tenrikyō headquarters official (*honbu-in*), fulfilled the administrative duties until Shōzen was mature enough to handle them on his own from 1925.

The deaths of Izō in 1907 and Shinnosuke in 1914 left an unprecedented power vacuum within the Tenrikyō leadership. The loss of these two important leaders marked a beginning of a period of stagnation within the movement after Miki’s thirtieth nensai in 1916 (Arakitōryō Henshūbu 2003a, 20). While Ueda Naraito succeeded Izō as the person that bestowed the Sazuke, the *tenkeisha* role was left unfulfilled. According to Oguri Junko, following Izō’s death, the Nakayamas sought to consolidate Tenrikyō’s administrative leadership under their control and felt the need to limit the role of Izō’s chosen successor. One of

the reasons for this may stem from Naraito's refusal to bestow the Sazuke to particular individuals whom she felt were unqualified to receive the transmission (Toyoshima 90). Toyoshima Yasukuni also describes how Naraito's revelatory style was not entirely oracular but mostly physical—through illnesses, particular actions and gestures—that could not be effectively interpreted by those around her (*ibid.* 91; 109). Oguri's sources insist that Naraito was locked away in her home and prevented from fulfilling her role as the second Honseki. Oguri then describes how Naraito shocked onlooking followers when she jumped from her second story window onto a pine tree when she sensed the urgent need to deliver 'timely talks' to the congregation. Oguri argues that the Nakayama family used this opportunity to declare Naraito insane and suppressed her charismatic authority (1970, 188-189).

As striking as these descriptions may seem, Oguri fails to take into account the bias of her sources. She is heavily dependent on histories written by critics of the Tenrikyō institution and information from her interviews with novelist Serizawa Kōjirō 芹沢光治良, who I suspect to be a supporter of Ide Kuni. However, it is not my intent to question the historical accuracy of Oguri's arguments as it is almost impossible to resolve whether or not the above events occurred in the manner she describes. It is most important here to recognize that there existed to some limited degree a perception that the Nakayamas improperly consolidating their authority by strengthening the status of Shinbashira (or kanchō) and silencing the voice of revelation at this time.



### The expectation of the return of revelation in Tenrikyō

For followers who believed that revelation would be a constant presence in Tenrikyō, the announcement of Naraito's insanity was a serious setback for their expectations. At the time of the aforementioned 'One Hundred Days Osashizu,' Izō had urged headquarters officials to build a residence for Naraito, his chosen successor (*tsugi-me*) just as the institution faced a financial crisis caused by its repeated applications to the Home Ministry to attain sectarian independence and for its economic support of the Russo-Japanese war. Later on when he reiterated his choice of Naraito as his successor, Izō declared "while she may be unsightly at present, she will gradually become accustomed to the task" (Os 6: 4729, Meiji 40 [1907] June 6). Once Naraito was declared incapable of bestowing Sazuke transmissions, Nakayama Tamae, Shinnosuke's widow, took over for her in 1918. A number of followers who were familiar with passages from the 'One Hundred Days Osashizu' and 'Osashizu of the Three Houses' felt there was no scriptural basis for passing the mantle of bestowing the Sazuke to a member of the Nakayama family.<sup>100</sup> While the *Osashizu* was silent on the subject of where and when a possible prophet may reappear, there appeared a number of theories within the movement.

According to Murakami Shigeyoshi, there was a widespread belief in the phenomenon known as the 'year of the succession' (*tsugi-me no nengen*), twenty-five years after the passing of Nakayama Miki (1974, 51). A number of Tenrikyō followers transformed the aforementioned doctrine of the 'everliving' Foundress into the expectation that a new revelator would appear in the year after the year

---

<sup>100</sup> To the best of my knowledge, there is at best, only an implicit reference in scripture that requires the office of the Shinbashira to be filled by a member of the Nakayama family. See Os (I: 661-664, Meiji 23 [1890] April 20) for a passage that can be interpreted to make the case for the Tenrikyō establishment that the Shinbashira is a hereditary office.

Miki would have turned one hundred and fifteen years old. Thus the year of Aijirō's mystical experience (1913) coincided with this belief in the 'year of the succession' and gave credence to the claims Shinnosuke died because he no longer had a role in leading Tenrikyō.

There were again heightened expectations of a tenkeisha to appear in 1936 and 1937, which coincided with the thirtieth nensai of Izō, the fiftieth nensai of Miki, and the centennial anniversary of the founding of Tenrikyō (Yumiyama 54). There appeared various new movements that were formed by former Tenrikyō and Tenri Kenkyūkai members<sup>101</sup> as well as a renewed vigor within these parent bodies themselves. Aijirō eventually led his followers on another distribution campaign in 1938, printing nine million copies of *Shoshin* 書信, a work geared for a more general audience than the *Kenkyū Shiryō*.<sup>102</sup>

### The writings of Masuno Kosetsu

Kosetsu was the pseudonym of Masuno Michioki, the eldest son of Masuno Shōbei, a honbu-in official of Tenrikyō headquarters who overlooked the finances of the institution and was employed as one of the transcribers of Iburi Izō's oral instructions that would become the *Osashizu* (Kawauchi 73, n. 3). Shōbei also served as the first president of Tenrikyō Dōyūsha, Tenrikyō's publishing company, and Nakayama Shinnosuke considered him as an

---

<sup>101</sup> Just to name a few of these individuals, they include Katsu Hisano 勝ひさの (Tenri Sanrinkō 天理三輪講), Watanabe Yoso (Tenri-kami no Uchi-ake Basho 天理神の打開場所), Yamada Umejirō (Tenri-kami no Kuchi-ake Basho/Ōkanmichi 天理神の口明場所・おうかんみち), Aida Hide 会田ヒデ (Sekai Shindōkyō 世界心道教), and Idei Seitarō 出居清太郎 (Shūyōdan Hōseikai 修養団捧誠会). For information on Katsu Hisano and Yamada Umejirō, refer to Yumiyama. For a description in English of Idei Seitarō's background and a recent look at his movement Shūyōdan Hōseikai, see Kjsala (141-155).

<sup>102</sup> For the contents of the *Kenkyū Shiryō* and *Shoshin*, refer to NSSS (107-131 and 131-187 respectively).

irreplaceable member of the ecclesiastic order. As the son of an important church official in an organization that still largely fills its top positions from a pool of qualified individuals descended from Miki's most devoted followers, Kosetsu moved quickly through the ranks following his graduation from Meiji University.

Kosetsu was a regular contributor to the Tenrikyō periodical *Michi no tomo* since 1909 and became the head of the editorial board at Dōyūsha in 1914. In 1916, at the age of twenty-seven, he was promoted to a junior honbu-in and had largely taken over Udagawa Bunkai's position as the main writer of *Michi no tomo*. Following his rise to the rank of a honbu-in official in 1918, he was appointed the headmaster of the Tenri Seminary in February 1920. After 1909 the Tenri Seminary had become a school solely geared toward the training of future missionaries that offered a six-month and a twelve-month course (respectively known as *Bekka* and *Honka*). According to Aochi Shin, Kosetsu eschewed the State Shintō-flavored Meiji Kyōten in favor of a curriculum that was more representative of Miki's teachings (1970, 234). Under Masuno Kosetsu's tutelage, graduates of the six-month *Bekka* course rose from seven hundred and seventeen in 1920 to ten thousand, four hundred and four in 1925, the year he stepped down from the headmaster's position. In his six years in charge of the Tenri Seminary, Kosetsu oversaw the training of more than thirty thousand *Bekka* graduates (*ibid.* 235).

Kosetsu wrote that it was unclear whether or not the 'succession' (*tsugime*) of the charismatic helm from Izō to Naraito included the ability to transmit revelations on top of the power to bestow the Sazuke to followers (MKZ 21: 45). Kosetsu then describes two prevailing views regarding the issue of revelation within the Tenrikyō institution. The first view, the establishment's

interpretation, is that revelation ended with the death of the Honseki Izō. In the same way a babe is weaned from her mother's milk, it was argued that in order for human beings to spiritually mature sufficiently, followers needed to be weaned from revelation (*ibid.* 21: 46). However, it is clear that Kosetsu strongly favored the second view that expected the return of revelation in some shape or form. In a section entitled "*Tenkei no sairai*" (the return of revelation) from a work published in July 1918 (Ueda R. 232-233), while acceding that revelation seems to have been suspended for the time being, Kosetsu also wrote

if revelation is interrupted forever, it would mean the prophecies of the Foundress are those of an impostor and the last instructions of the Honseki are those of a liar. We absolutely cannot believe that the Foundress and the Honseki handed down false predictions. If one is to ask why, it is because the words of the Foundress and the Honseki have all steadily come to realization (MKZ 3: 14).

Kosetsu further argued that the return of revelation was the only way for Tenrikyō to successfully overcome the tragedy of Shinnosuke's unexpected death (MKZ 3: 20). Kosetsu's conviction was great enough that he was a proponent in favor of conferring the rank of Honseki on Ibaragi Motoyoshi 茨木基敬 (1855-1929), a honbu-in of church headquarters and the founding head minister of Kita Daikyōkai (TJ 54). Ibaragi is said to have had his first kamigakari on the night of November 18, 1911. Rumors later began to spread that his spiritual guidance led people to attain miraculous healings. Ibaragi was said to have been critical of the Taishō construction, the sole honbu-in to voice such an opinion, insisting that it would place an unnecessary financial burden on the Tenrikyō membership. He is also attributed to have foretold Shinnosuke's death and the deaths of five other important leaders of the clergy (Toyoshima 111-112). While it was never clear whether or not Ibaragi claimed he was Iburi Izō's successor, many members of

Kita Daikyōkai gradually came to be convinced his revelations arose from a divine source. Contrary to Kosetsu's hopes, the decision was made at a meeting of leading honbu-in to expel Ibaragi Motoyoshi together with his son Mototada, the head minister of Kita Daikyōkai, on January 16, 1918. Kosetsu's youth may have been a factor that prevented him from successfully appealing his case to name Ibaragi the next Honseki. Yamanaka Hikoshichi was appointed the new head minister of Kita on January 17. Ibaragi and his son eventually left Jiba in November 1921 (TJKH 194).

The decision to expel Ibaragi from the Tenrikyō institution can be tied to Matsumura Kichitarō's visit to the charismatic minister in late 1917. Not only was Matsumura the head of the Osaka diocese under whose jurisdiction Kita Daikyōkai belonged, but he was also the individual largely responsible for initiating Tenrikyō's sectarian independence movement and keeping it alive until its fulfillment. As a relative of the Nakayama family, Matsumura held a deep interest in maintaining the authority of the hereditary office of the Shinbashira and protecting the Tenrikyō institution from a charismatic leader who could possibly endanger its legal status as a Kyōha Shintō sect.

When Ibaragi was first handed a temporary suspension from his duties in January 1917, the congregation of Kita Daikyōkai initially sent a letter of apology to Tenrikyō headquarters promising they would no longer consider Ibaragi's words as revelation. However, according to certain Tenrikyō histories, the members made no attempt to follow up on their promise. When Matsumura paid his visit, Ibaragi came out, hands tied with rope, and explained, "Though it would have been proper to visit you at your residence instead, I could not do so as an offender (*zainin* 罪人) of Tenrikyō. That is why I have appeared before you with my hands tied" (TTDS 539). Yet despite Ibaragi's acknowledgement of his

position within the religious institution, Matsumura was unable to persuade him to recant his revelations. Matsumura then reported back to his colleagues in the Tenrikyō leadership and they used the account of Ibaragi's bizarre behavior as justification to dismiss him on the premise of insanity.<sup>103</sup> Since the Tenrikyō institution had adopted a traditional, hereditary form of centralized leadership over a charismatic one since Iburi Izō's death, its expulsion of the two tenkeisha Ibaragi Motoyoshi and Ōnishi Aijirō can be viewed as a natural course of action taken by a confessional religion as it "was a necessary step toward consolidating the authority of the organization and securing this authority in the hands of the Nakayama family" (Aochi 1970, 225).

#### Conversion data of four Tenri Kenkyūkai members

Umehara (1977) is an excellent source on Honmichi that presents the personal life histories of four members that later became leading officials of the movement when it gained the status of a legal religious corporation in 1946. A look into their situations before and immediately after they were motivated to join the Tenri Kenkyūkai helps illuminate the many factors contributing to the appeal of the movement.

All four individuals—Yamada Masaru, Kobayashi Gunji, Kokubo Shōichi, and Yamaguchi Kichirō—were second or third generation Tenrikyō followers. All four members were born and raised in rural areas of Japan.<sup>104</sup> Three out of

---

<sup>103</sup> While Ibaragi urged his followers to avoid forming a rival religious movement to Tenrikyō, his charismatic successors (called *okikai-sama* お機械さま) have survived and their version of the Tenrikyō teachings has gained a limited presence on the Internet.

<sup>104</sup> Though my research is at a preliminary stage, there is data that may suggest the Tenri Kenkyūkai reflected a rural demographic and was perhaps a reaction against the rise of an urbanized membership. According to Ōya Wataru, Tenrikyō experienced its greatest expansion between 1923 and 1926 (69), which occurred as a result of the "double the membership campaign" drive (*baika undō*). He also quotes an article from *Michi no tomo* that mentioned how

the four joined the Tenri Kenkyūkai due to the recommendation of one their parents following their visit to Takenouchi. Yamada Masaru was one of them, and by attending the *oseki* he felt that he gradually began to understand the meaning behind the very elements of Tenrikyō he had questioned (Umehara 1977, 131). To be specific, Masaru always wondered about the identity of the third house in the Tenrikyō expression “the carpenter at the gate and the blacksmith within; build the three houses and the path will become one.”<sup>105</sup> Once it was explained to him this third house referred to the Ōnishi house, Masaru subsequently became a devout adherent and engaged in proselytizing to convert the ministers of Tenrikyō churches (*kyōkai nioi-gake*).

Kobayashi Gunji grew up in an environment where there was a stigma associated with being a Tenrikyō follower. His maternal grandmother was particularly renown for her devotion. When his father Daikichi entered Bekka, the six-month missionary course at the Tenri Seminary, Gunji took care of the farm work at home. Daikichi then went to Hakata City to engage in *tandoku fukyō* and came into contact with Aijirō's teachings.

Gunji was at this time a live-in helper at his Tenrikyō church, Yashiro Bunkiyōkai. Daikichi contacted his son by mail and urged him to secretly check the *Osashizu* but the church lacked copies of the ‘One Hundred Days Osashizu’ and ‘Osashizu of the Three Houses.’ Daikichi made his way to his church dormitory in Jiba and spoke about Ōnishi Aijirō, the new prophet, among his peers. As a result, Daikichi was revoked of his instructors’ license and this even

---

the majority of new Bekka students were from the cities. His data suggests that Tenrikyō membership in rural areas leveled off and Tenrikyō was becoming more of an urban phenomenon (Ōya 71). Aochi Shin also acknowledges the trend (1970, 243-244) and argues “The plain and simple character that had been traditionally part of the organization was replaced by an urban tendency toward frivolous utilitarianism” (*ibid.* 246).

<sup>105</sup> The carpenter in this expression is Izō, and the blacksmith Shinnosuke.

led to his father (a director at Yashiro Bunkiyōkai) being dismissed from his position.

Gunji, who still lived at the church, was in the position of being lectured on the importance of working harder than the average follower to accumulate the good merit that would enable his father Daikichi to awaken to the error of his ways. Gunji took offense and argued with his ministers that they were in no position to criticize his father when they had no clue of the theological position of the Tenri Kenkyūkai. Gunji then left to find out for himself what his father had become involved with. Gunji not only ended up a convert but also joined his parents in Hakata. Since his grandmother lived with the hope of a *tenkeisha* to succeed Miki, she also joined the Kobayashi family in their missionary effort (*ibid.* 138-140).

Kokubo Shōichi grew up without any particular interest in Tenrikyō. In fact, he found the Tenrikyō followers to be an impoverished lot. Shōichi was more impressed with the intellectual and fashionable character of Christians. While the manager at the *shōyu* and *sake* store he was employed at was a Christian follower, the store owner was a devotee of Higashi Honganji. As a result, many of the store employees were encouraged to listen to Shinshū sermons on a regular basis.

Meanwhile, Shōichi's father became involved with the *Shinri-ha* (absolute truth faction) of the Tenrikyō institution. This group emphasized teaching the direct words of Miki and were particularly against the rise of the Nakayama main family line and what they saw as the 'opportunistic modernization' of Tenrikyō (Umehara 1977, 144). As a reform movement within the church, sermons of the Shinri-ha tended to resonate deeper with followers. Aijirō's teachings began circulating among Shinri-ha followers in 1923 and an increasing



number of them visited Takenouchi. The aforementioned Suzuki Daizō was one of these Shinri-ha advocates who joined the Tenri Kenkyūkai. Shōichi was continuously urged by his father to attend Aijirō's lectures.

Shōichi finally assented and was amazed at the sight of followers cleaning the roof tiles of the buildings. He was also struck at the joy of the people at the Tenri Kenkyūkai despite their meager diet and clothing. Shōichi became ashamed at the fine clothes he had been wearing. Also, Shōichi felt that Aijirō's lectures far surpassed the content of the Shinshū sermons to which he was accustomed (*ibid.* 143-146).

Born Morimoto Kichirō in 1903, Kichirō grew up in an environment where many of his childhood friends and classmates were children of Tenrikyō adherents. When playing with his friends, they often pretended to be Tenrikyō ministers. Once an adult, Kichirō desired to emigrate to Brazil and saved to raise funds for the boat fare. Before he could make his departure, he became ill and was encouraged by his minister that his illness was a sign from Tsuki-Hi to enter Bekka in 1924 and become a Tenrikyō missionary so he could spread the teachings in Brazil. During his time as a Bekka student, Kichirō became acquainted with Yamagata Tokumatsu, the caretaker of Miki's gravesite. Kichirō was awed at the number of Tenrikyō followers who would gather around Yamagata and hear of stories of Miki's life. Yamagata was a devout follower who had lived at the Nakayama household since 1884.

Kichirō came to have great respect for Yamagata, and approached him when he suffered a swelling in his foot. Yamagata urged him to read the 'One Hundred Days Osashizu' and the 'Osashizu of the Three Houses' in order to fully understand Tenrikyō's teachings. While an official of church headquarters himself, Yamagata was severely critical of the actions of other honbu-in. Kichirō

then left to engage in *tandoku fukyō* in Oita Prefecture and made Yamagata promise to contact him when the expected revelator appeared.

Kichirō's efforts as a Tenrikyō missionary in Beppu City were unsuccessful and he resolved to commit suicide in a *noten-buro* (outdoor bath) to atone for his failure. Kichirō dreamed that Miki chastised him for his impatience and he awoke with a jolt. Kichirō was later approached by a follower who had been seeking a Tenrikyō minister to instruct her. While Kichirō attained newfound success in gaining adherents through the woman's acquaintances, he received word from Yamagata who was overjoyed at discovering Aijirō and the Tenri Kenkyūkai which was embarking on the 'true' Tenrikyō path. Yamagata's home that overlooked Miki's grave had become a gathering place for Tenri Kenkyūkai adherents. Yamagata proved to be the only honbu-in that visited Takenouchi and was subsequently expelled. Yamagata urged Kichirō to marry before his return to Oita to resume his missionary work in the name of Tenri Kenkyūkai. Kichirō returned with his bride to Oita to propagate Aijirō's teachings to Tenrikyō churches. Kichirō was unmatched as a missionary who could utilize the *Osashizu* to back his arguments. Kichirō found many adherents among older Tenrikyō members who were disillusioned with the establishment's policy of not allowing its general followers access to the *Osashizu* (*ibid.* 148-156).

### **Factors contributing to the appeal of the Tenri Kenkyūkai**

There were several factors behind the appeal of the Tenri Kenkyūkai among Tenrikyō adherents. Both Murakami Shigeyoshi and Umehara Masaki each have offered their respective opinions on the matter. Murakami wrote that a number of followers held doubts and felt dissatisfaction concerning the

direction of the movement. Aijirō's claims "unexpectedly resonated with those in positions of leadership and the general congregation who sought drastic reform in doctrinal and organizational matters" (Murakami 1974, 129). Umehara has suggested the Tenri Kenkyūkai was able to appeal to a variety of dissenting cleavages that had already existed within the Tenrikyō organization (1975, 123). Ultimately, the results of their research can be summarized into the following six conditions: (1) an expectation of the return of revelation in Tenrikyō's postcharismatic phase; (2) an increasing reaction against the consolidation of administrative power into the hands of the Nakayama family; (3) the degree of the general membership's access to scripture; (4) a perceived dissonance between Miki's teachings and the Tenrikyō establishment; (5) alienation experienced by missionaries under a suppressive hierarchical *kyōkai* system; and finally, (6) Aijirō's own charismatic appeal as a religious figure.

The expectation of the return of revelation among Tenrikyō members has already been discussed at some length. Masuno Kosetsu was an important member of the clergy who expected revelation to return and oversaw the training of numerous Tenrikyō missionaries, among them future Honmichi official Yamaguchi Kichirō. Kichirō was also influenced by the beliefs of Yamagata Tokumatsu, the caretaker of Miki's gravesite. While I could not find Yamagata's name anywhere in the Tenrikyō sources I have seen so far, it is not implausible to suggest the possibility that he has been erased from Tenrikyō histories for his defection to the Tenri Kenkyūkai and Honmichi. It has also been noted that the grandmother of another future Honmichi official, Kobayashi Gunji, expected the reappearance of a charismatic *tenkeisha*. It is clear from these examples of individuals within the Tenrikyō organization who did not

conform to the self-defined position established by church leadership that revelation had ended with the death of Iburi Izō.

Though it is unclear how accurate are the suggestions that the Nakayama family actively competed with the Iburi and Ueda families over central authority in the movement (Kasahara 486), there was a perception that the Nakayamas illegitimately rose to power at the expense of suppressing the charismatic position of the Honseki. The Shinri-ha faction within the Tenrikyō congregation in particular expressed their opposition to the consolidation of administrative power into the hands of the Nakayama family and many of the faction's members left to join Ōnishi Aijirō's movement. Iburi Izō's spiritual heir Ueda Naraito was declared insane and the role of bestowing the charismatic transmissions known as the Sazuke was taken over by Nakayama Tamae. Tanaka Hōshū, a local newspaper reporter of the Yamato area and critic of the Tenrikyō institution, would declare in his work *Tenrikyō zaiaku shi* ('The history of Tenrikyō's evil transgressions') that it was unbecoming for a religionist to have taken this action and disregard the will of Miki and Izō (quoted in Oguri 1970, 189).<sup>106</sup>

Aochi argues that by the time of Iburi Izō's death in 1907, the position known as the Honseki had become completely expendable and unnecessary in the administration of the Tenrikyō institution (1970, 223). Tenrikyō's transition from a charismatic meritocracy to that of a hereditary oligarchy was more or less complete and the administration of the Tenrikyō organization increasingly became a family affair. During Nakayama Shinnosuke's tenure as the administrative leader of Tenrikyō, relatives of the Nakayama family such as

---

<sup>106</sup> Unfortunately, the original remains unavailable to me at this time.

Shinnosuke's cousin Matsumura Kichitarō and brother-in-law Yamazawa Tamezō held important positions in the organization. As mentioned, Matsumura was in charge of Tenrikyō's drive toward sectarian independence and Yamazawa later served as the de facto leader of the institution until Shinnosuke's son Nakayama Shōzen came of age in 1925. In the same year, Shōzen was admitted into the Religious Studies Course of the Literature Department at Tokyo University. According to Aochi Shin, this development represented an important turning point for the Tenrikyō institution.

In Tenrikyō's early history there was a superstition among Tenrikyō faithful at all levels that those who received a higher education would suffer an early death. As far as Miki's teachings were concerned, she was known to have said that the salvation of scholars and the 'high mountains' (elites) was to take place after the majority of the populace achieved a life of joyousness (*gakusha to takayama ato-mawari*) and expressed her opposition when her grandson Shinnosuke voiced his wish to study in the capital. Shōzen's entry into Tokyo University began a trend for the successors of Tenrikyō officials to be college-educated, marking the emergence of a privileged strata within a religion that was essentially directed toward the masses (Aochi 1970, 253-255). A survey of a total of twelve thousand missionaries conducted in 1928 revealed that the number of those who had graduated or at least attended college or a vocational school made up less than one percent, while as many as 24.2 percent had no formal education whatsoever (*ibid.* 229-230). Stark and Bainbridge have proposed that any inclination toward such stratification within a religious group indicate potential areas where organizational divisions will occur (1985, 102-103). This theory may partly explain the reason that the Tenri Kenkyūkai disproportionately drew its membership from lower-class clergy who decided to

head toward such a high degree of tension with its social environment by denouncing the divine status of the emperor of Japan.

To elaborate on the degree of followers' access to scripture, the Tenrikyō establishment had denied to government authorities that the *Ofudesaki* was even in existence until 1928, which happens to be the very year of the Tenri Kenkyūkai incident (KNH 30). Nevertheless, manuscripts of the sacred text were secretly circulated and privately published by individuals and branch churches as early as 1908 (Nakayama Shōzen 1962, 222). Though manuscripts of the *Doroumi Kōki*, the Tenrikyō cosmogony that implicitly challenged the divinity of the emperor, were collected and burned, several versions survived and continued to be secretly read by followers.

Access to certain passages of the *Osashizu* was limited to ministers at a fixed ecclesiastical level and a missionary at Aijirō's rank was normally excluded from viewing them. Aijirō had come into contact with the 'Osashizu of the Three Houses' completely by chance.<sup>107</sup> It seems that it was not entirely coincidental that all thirty-six fascicles of the *Osashizu* were privately published by non-follower Tanabe Yōzō in 1925, the same year of the Tenri Kenkyūkai's founding. The availability of the entire *Osashizu* certainly helped spur their study of scripture. This gave Tenri Kenkyūkai missionaries a great advantage as they attempted to convert Tenrikyō followers. Aijirō, through his sermons known as the *oseki*, could give his explanations of the revelations that were the foundation of his spiritual legitimacy to followers who were previously denied an opportunity to study scripture.

---

<sup>107</sup> Refer to Umehara (1977, 67-69) for the story on how Aijirō came to have these passages in his possession.

Access to and knowledge of the ‘unofficial’ scriptures of the *Ofudesaki* and *Doroumi Kōki* helped influence the perceived dissonance between Miki’s teachings and the Tenrikyō establishment as the institution increasingly compromised and cooperated with the state. The adoption of the Meiji Kyōten particularly reflected a level of compromise that could not be avoided. “The question was not how much of the Shinto teachings could be tolerated in the Tenrikyo doctrine; rather, it was how much of the Tenrikyo teachings could be expressed in a doctrine which would be dominantly colored by State Shinto” (TOMD 1998, 63). 1906 saw the introduction of a prayer to be read at morning and evening services (*asa-yū shinpai norito* 朝夕神拝祝詞) and a list of followers’ regulations (*shinto sanpai kokoro-e* 信徒参拝心得) to be displayed at all churches that functioned as public declarations of loyalty toward the emperor and the state. The second article of the followers’ regulations read as follows: “Before petitioning every prayer for their happiness and that of their families, worshipers are obligated, without fail, to pray for peace during the imperial reign of the eternal nation” (TJ 453).

The Tenrikyō institution financially assisted the government during the Sino-Japanese war with a ten thousand yen donation, a significant sum considering that the combined donations of the Higashi and Nishi Honganji came out to the same amount. At the Russo-Japanese war, Tenrikyō paid off the state’s 2.5 million yen debt and made an additional one million yen donation to the soldiers’ relief fund (Aochi 1970, 219). Needless to say, Tenrikyō’s financial support of Japan’s wars went against the spirit of Miki’s teachings (“Tsuki-Hi sincerely desires only to end the wars among those on the high mountains,” Of XIII: 50). Aochi Shin writes

From a pure doctrinal standpoint in which the people of the world are brothers and sisters, it would have been unthinkable for the Tenrikyō organization to cooperate with the war. During the war with China and World War II, a few morally-driven ministers were said to have told followers who were being sent to the front, “Though you are going off to war, shoot your guns toward the sky.” Evidence suggests that the number of followers who opposed the organization’s cooperation with the war were by no means few (Aochi 1970, 220).

The anti-imperial, anti-war stance of the Tenri Kenkyūkai can be viewed as an extreme means to legitimate its position as the correct expression of Miki’s teachings during the oppressive political environment of the early Shōwa period.

There is also evidence that missionaries experienced an increasing degree of alienation under a suppressive hierarchical *kyōkai* system. Aochi has argued that Tenrikyō experienced a period of stagnation in which one of the major causes was the financial crisis experienced by many branch churches following the Taishō construction. Churches were either required to meet financial quotas or prepare the lumber necessary for the construction project. A few ministers risked their lives collecting the building materials from all over Japan, pledging to take their own lives if they could not obtain the lumber by a certain day. After Nakayama Shinnosuke’s death, rumors spread that he had incurred the wrath of Tsuki-Hi by overexploiting branch churches in order to build the grand worship hall (Aochi 1970, 225).

Aochi gives three examples of large branch churches that experienced financial hardships in the Taishō period. Kotō Daikyōkai (139 branch churches in 1919) entered the land development/reclamation business in Hokkaidō in hopes it would raise enough money to clear its debts. However, this business venture failed and the church’s debts inflated and Tenrikyō headquarters was forced to temporarily suspend Kotō Daikyōkai’s role in church affairs for failing



to pay its church fees. Kōriyama Daikyōkai (219 branch churches in 1917) had a debt of over two hundred thousand yen (equal to over two hundred million yen in 1970) and was forced to sell its land in a public auction in 1917. The minister officials of Chikushi Bunkiyōkai (57 branch churches in 1919) literally worried themselves sick over the debts they had accumulated (*ibid.* 227).

Many other branch churches were unable to provide their children with an education and lacked many daily necessities. Serizawa Kōjirō's *Ningen no unmei* ('Fate of man') is a work that has received attention as the author's documentation of the type of hardships he experienced as a child born into a family of a branch church minister. The Tenri Kenkyūkai's study of scripture allowed them to reject any resemblance of a branch church system.<sup>108</sup> Aijirō's own experience with the Nara Shikyōkai would have been enough to discourage this organizational structure, yet his movement was able to attract many other disenchanted members who felt likewise and shared Aijirō's experiences. The Shinri-ha faction has also been noted for its stand against the kyōkai system (Umehara 1975, 123). The Tenri Kenkyūkai was able to effectively draw its converts from a pool of disillusioned Tenrikyō followers who were seeking a religious organization that offered a more satisfying connection with Miki. The very fact that a few of them went on to form religious movements of their own can attest to this.

Finally, to elaborate on Aijirō's own charisma as a religious figure, while he may not have been a performer of miracles as Nakayama Miki was in her lifetime, Aijirō nevertheless gained the loyalty of a following who were fearless in the face of government persecution. Aijirō was revered as 'Kanrodai-sama,' a

---

<sup>108</sup> According to Murakami Shigeyoshi, Honmichi rejected a branch church system similar to Tenrikyō's based on the following *Osashizu* passage from July 7, 1890 [Meiji 23]: "There shall be no churches [emerging] from this Path (*kono michi kara kyōkai wa arōmai*)" (1974, 133).

prophet and a living kami by his adherents. When Yamaguchi Kichirō was questioned in prison whether he thought Ōnishi Aijirō was a kami, he answered, “While the emperor is not a kami, Kanrodai-sama is” (Umehara 1977, 182). When a school teacher questioned a Honmichi’s follower’s child on who he thought was greater, the emperor or the human Kanrodai, the child shocked his teacher by unhesitatingly declaring his reverence for “Kanrodai-sama” (*ibid.* 170; 172).

### **Implications of the emergence of Tenri Kenkyūkai (Honmichi)**

Ōnishi Aijirō was expelled from the Tenrikyō clergy with the revoking of his religious license in 1924 and ministers and followers who had subsequently visited the Tenri Kenkyūkai headquarters in Takenouchi met the same fate. Unlike the active steps Miki took in suppressing Sukezō and that of Tenrikyō officials to remove the divided spirit of the kami from the Mizu-yashiki, the Tenrikyō establishment responded to the emergence of the Tenri Kenkyūkai less assertively and seemed content to allow police officials to take aggressive action against Aijirō’s heretical movement.

In 1926 when Matsumura Kichitarō was appointed to the Department of Doctrine and Historical Materials (Kyōgi oyobi Shiryō Shūseibu), he planned to publish the entire collection of Tenrikyō scripture. The emergence of the Tenri Kenkyūkai and Aijirō’s arrest following the distribution of the *Kenkyū Shiryō* in 1928 helped accelerate the project as Tenrikyō headquarters published their own versions of the *Ofudesaki* with commentary notes (the *Ofudesaki chūshaku*) in the same year and the *Osashizu* between 1927 and 1931. A five-day doctrinal seminar on the *Ofudesaki* was also sponsored by Tenrikyō headquarters between October and November 1928. Two doctrinal seminars on the *Osashizu* were held in July

and August 1929. “In other words, there was a necessity to stop the spread of heresy due to the misinterpretation of scripture by making the *Ofudesaki* and the *Osashizu* available to the public and presenting the orthodox interpretations” (Nakajima 1994, 24). By offering all branch churches a copy of the *Ofudesaki* and an entire set of the *Osashizu* in commemoration of the dual anniversaries in 1936 and 1937 (Miki’s fiftieth nensai and the hundredth anniversary of Tenrikyō’s founding), the Tenrikyō establishment must have also intended to distribute ‘official’ versions of these texts in which verses and passages that they considered apocryphal or potentially problematic were removed. It must be noted that the official version of the *Osashizu* numbered thirty-three fascicles, three less than the version Tanabe Yōzō published in 1925. In 1934, following the construction of the present South Worship Hall, a complete wooden model (*‘hinagata’*) of the Kanrodai that was built to Miki’s specific directions in the *Ofudesaki* was installed as the visual marker of the Jiba for the first time.<sup>109</sup> While this construction project is presented in Tenrikyō histories as a step in preparation for the dual anniversaries, the Tenrikyō establishment may have thought the time was right to install the model Kanrodai to remind followers of the orthodox view that the Kanrodai was a physical marker of sacred place and not a prophet as Aijirō claimed.

Aijirō was originally sentenced to four years of penal servitude for *lèse-majesté*, yet he was acquitted in 1930 and released from prison in 1931 on

---

<sup>109</sup> The first time a marker of any kind was installed at the Jiba was in June 1875 following Miki’s identification of the sacred spot. This first model of the Kanrodai was made by Iburi Izō out of wood and was about two meters high. Construction of a stone Kanrodai began in 1881 but was halted after only making two tiers, which were subsequently confiscated by the police in 1882. Following this the Jiba was marked by a pile of pebbles. In 1888, a two-tiered Kanrodai made from wooden boards was placed at the Jiba. 1934 was the first time a full version of the thirteen-tiered Kanrodai (approximately 2.5 meters high) was made and installed at the Jiba. The *hinagata* Kanrodai is periodically replaced on special occasions or when it has been toppled by intruders. The Kanrodai was most recently replaced in July 2000. For more information on the history of the Kanrodai, refer to Tenrikyō Dōyūsha (1994).

grounds of innocence due to diminished mental capacity. Observers have commented that Aijirō was freed in this way because the prosecution wished to avoid having the divinity of the emperor challenged in a judicial court (Murakami 1975, 183; Umehara 1977, 184). As a result of his acquittal, Aijirō and Tenri Kenkyūkai members felt vindicated, and they perceived Japan's increasing involvement in military expansion on the Asian mainland as signs their religious quest was far from over. Aijirō began to denounce the Tenrikyō institution's emphasis on sacred space and their unwillingness to acknowledge him as the proper leader of the movement, "If [one is to acknowledge] the tenkeisha as the treasure, then the land [s/he stands on] is nothing more than a box. No matter how much time goes by, the path of single-hearted devotion to the kami will not be established just by carrying an empty box" (Aochi 1974, 242). In 1937 he renamed his movement Tenri Honmichi ('The True Path of Tenri'), and resumed its propagation directed toward Tenrikyō branch churches. The change in the name of the movement reflects a change in the attitude of its members, that the group was no longer content in presenting itself as a 'study association' for Tenrikyō members. The movement was beginning to assert its doctrinal interpretations as the 'true' expression of Miki's teachings. (It also helped that the term '*honmichi*' appeared in the *Ofudesaki*, which may partly explain the movement simply came to be known as 'Honmichi' in 1950.) Aijirō later sent his officials Nakai Ginjirō, Nakagawa Zenroku, and Koura Yoshio to Tenrikyō headquarters to secure a meeting with new administrative leader Nakayama Shōzen. Matsumura Kichitarō stopped the party from proceeding any further and argued with them over their heretical doctrine. The Tenrikyō establishment subsequently reissued a command directing their followers not to associate with

Tenri Honmichi members and further warned that those who had heard Aijirō's teachings would be subject to severe punishment (Umehara 1977, 189-190).

The illness of Aijirō's wife To'o inspired a more ambitious distribution campaign in 1938. Once To'o awoke from her coma the day after Tenri Honmichi members sent their religious propaganda to several newspapers, they were compelled to print nine million copies of the work *Shoshin*. Aijirō and his followers were again arrested for *lèse-majesté* and violation of the Peace Preservation Law. The government ordered Tenri Honmichi to disband in August 1939. The state's crackdown of Tenri Honmichi led investigators to closely scrutinize its parent body, Tenrikyō. Officials from the Ministry of Education approached and sought immediate changes in the Tenrikyō institution to suit the needs of the current political situation enacted with the passing of the National Mobilization Act. Inquiries were made into whether 'Kanrodai' referred to a person, a symbol, or a place, and the Tenrikyō establishment was pressed to abolish the use of the term. The Tenrikyō institution faced a variety of changes issued under the name of 'reform' (*kakushin*), which included the deletion of the Yorozyo Hasshu and Songs Three and Five from the *Mikagura-uta* liturgy which included terms that were considered problematic by Ministry of Education officials.<sup>110</sup> Also, Instruction Eight ( *yutatsu hachigō* ) was issued in December 1938, which dictated that Tenrikyō instructors refrain from mentioning themes from the Doroumi Kōki cosmogony and fully rely on the Meiji Kyōten for all doctrinal and ritual matters (TJ 197; 321). In 1939 the editions of the Ofudesaki and Osashizu, issued to all branch churches only a few years

---

<sup>110</sup> Government officials pressed Tenrikyō leadership to change the verses containing offending terms 'original and true kami' (*moto no kami, jitsu no kami*; MKU III: 9-10) and 'Jiba of origin' (V: 9) but the latter decided to delete the Songs altogether instead of revising Miki's original text. The Yorozyo Hasshu, the prelude to the Twelve Songs in the *Mikagura-uta*, was considered problematic in that it implicitly referred to the *Doroumi Kōki* (TJ 321).

earlier, were recalled and burned under police supervision. While Tenrikyō was quick to abolish the Meiji Kyōten and restore the entire Mikagura-uta, Ofudesaki, and Osashizu to their proper place as canon following Japan's defeat in World War II, the existence of apocryphal texts such as the Kanrodai san-kudari ('Three Songs of the Kanrodai') and the millenarian-themed Tome-fude ('The Interruption of the Writing Brush')—both of which have been adopted by Honmichi and its schism Honbushin ('The True Construction') as canon—have been largely erased from the consciousness of Tenrikyō followers today.<sup>111</sup>

### Chapter conclusion

In its transition from a large institution headed by a designated prophet into one in which authority came to be transmitted through a hereditary office, Tenrikyō experienced cleavages within its membership and the appearance of several potential successors to fill the tenkeisha role. The differing views surrounding the expectancy of an inevitable return of revelation in Tenrikyō follows a 'two-story model' of charismatic routinization to some degree. To elaborate, in his study of the initial postcharismatic phase of the Christian Science movement, John K. Simmons questions whether the 'two-story model' (a phenomenon he sees in the now defunct schism known as the Parent Church or Church of the Universal Design) could be applied to other NRMs. In other words, Simmons asks whether postcharismatic schisms tend to draw the

---

<sup>111</sup> Tenrikyō's rejection of the *Kanrodai san-kudari* (whose authorship has been variously attributed to Nakayama Miki or her daughter Kokan) and the *Tome-fude* (claimed to be one of Miki's or Izō's 'timely talks') as canon can be credited to the fact their authorship is considered suspect by leading Tenrikyō theologians. Still, the contents of the *Tome-fude*, with its imagery of a future apocalypse would have been problematic enough for it to be eliminated from the *Osashizu* (Toyoshima 99; 196-201). See Iida (1982) for a Tenrikyō theologian's repudiation of the *Tome-fude* as scripture and his assessment of various 'speculations of the end of the world' (*shūmatsu shisō*).

“emotive, innovative, energetic members away from the mainstream adherents,” allowing the parent organization to follow a course toward further rationalization and institutionalization (Simmons 122).

Granted, Tenrikyō’s situation was more complex as there were several cleavages other than the schism between Tenrikyō and Honmichi. However, in its quest to legitimize itself as the ‘orthodox’ representative of her teachings, Honmichi openly embraced the most vigorous aspects of Miki’s antiestablishment stance during their campaign to distribute the Kenkyū Shiryō. The split between the two groups came over a disagreement over the proposed self-defined direction of Tenrikyō according to those who were in positions of authority in the religious institution. While Tenrikyō adopted the stable course toward routinization with a hereditary office, Honmichi cosmology reintroduced the phenomena of a religious organization led by a charismatic, apotheosized individual through the doctrine of the human Kanrodai. At the same time, Tenrikyō, the parent body, maintained that the period of revelation was over in their hope to eliminate the destabilizing effect of continued revelation that could potentially compromise their precarious legal status under the Japanese government. All self-proclaimed prophets who appeared within the movement were promptly expelled. The expulsion of the minister-turned-prophet Ibaragi Motoyoshi along with Aijirō represents a rejection of ongoing revelation in the Tenrikyō organization. Tenrikyō also responded to Aijirō’s claims to be Miki’s charismatic successor through publishing their own official versions and interpretations of the sacred canon.

The Tenrikyō-Honmichi schism also may help support the theories of Rodney Stark and William Sims Bainbridge. They claim a successful movement tends to become too accommodating over time and decreases the amount of

tension with its surroundings, a process that causes cleavage and encourages potential schism (Stark and Bainbridge, 1985, 101-108). While in Tenrikyō's case it can be argued that the leadership had no choice but accept changes in its doctrines and practice under the coercive surveillance of the state, the Tenri Kenkyūkai represents a sectarian break that actively encouraged the heightening of tension to the point they were viewed as traitors by society. Because Miki had suffered at the hands of the police in her lifetime, state oppression of Aijirō and his followers functioned as a legitimizing agent for the nascent organization.

In many ways schism represents "at least in part a struggle for organizational power. It is an attempt to impose one group's views on the whole" (Ammerman 101). While it was highly unlikely that the Tenrikyō establishment would surrender its authority to a missionary who was near the bottom of its ecclesiastical hierarchy since they were quick to expel Ibaragi, an official of church headquarters, Aijirō was more successful in disseminating his views to a significant sector of Tenrikyō membership. Certainly, the recent availability of scripture to followers and the expectation of the reappearance of revelation that was present even among those in positions of leadership were major contributing factors to the appeal of the Tenri Kenkyūkai.



— Conclusion —

The three ‘heresies’ or schisms from Tenrikyō discussed in this paper each emerged in a distinct sociological, historical, and ideological context. Both Tenrikyō and Tenrin-Ō-Kyōkai were founded in Yamato Province in the Bakumatsu period where state regulation of the religious market was relatively lax. Nakayama Miki attracted a following with her ability to heal and offer the assurance of safe childbirth to expectant mothers. This led to a number of heated confrontations by Shugendō priests in the region who were heavily dependent on the income they generated from offering *kitō* prayers and other promises of practical benefits. Imai Sukezō appears to have been motivated to take advantage of the situation with the patronage of local Tōzan-ha Shugendō temples. Sukezō offered the same types of magico-religious services as Miki and legitimized his position through a geographical manipulation of the *honji suijaku* doctrine. Although Sukezō was initially able to act the part of a charismatic healer of his day, Tenrikyō’s hagiographic materials indicate his claims to the superiority of his residence over Miki’s Jiba prompted her severe response. With the assistance of a small entourage of her closest adherents, Miki had Sukezō’s gohei destroyed. The incident represented a failed attempt to co-opt Miki’s position in her movement as she simply overpowered Sukezō and his Shugendō patron in the ensuing altercation.

While one is free to speculate the possibility that Sukezō forced Miki’s hand in the incident, there is no known source that can support this claim. (It may be notable to mention that Miki did not identify the specific location of the Jiba until the fifth month of 1875, ten years after the Sukezō jiken.) Also, although there is no documentation that supports the proposition that Miki regarded Sukezō as a ‘heretic,’ an important precedent was established with the

incident. Tenrikyō authorities today view the Sukezō jiken as Miki's approved method to deal with all future religious dissent. Miki's order to 'clear away' Sukezō's *gohei* dispels any doubt in the minds of the Tenrikyō faithful that she considered the *honji suijaku* claim as a heresy that needed to be suppressed.

In the aftermath of the Sukezō jiken, the priests of the Fudōin, the temple Sukezō was affiliated with, reacted by damaging Miki's home and physically harming one of her followers who carried out her orders to burn Sukezō's *gohei*. Miki subsequently chose a religious response to the situation by composing the first verse of the *Mikagura-uta* liturgy while her son Shūji initiated the short-lived legal recognition with Yoshida Shintō which she openly rejected. Tension between Miki's 'cult movement' and the status quo would be amplified with the inauguration of the Meiji regime and the abolishment of Yoshida Shintō. The religious market of the Meiji period grew increasingly hostile toward Tenrikyō and Shugendō as the national promulgation of State Shintō began to take hold. As Miki's movement gathered momentum, it was itself viewed as a form of heresy by local Shintō officials. While Tenrikyō finally attained legal status under the Shintō Honkyoku in 1888, the year after Miki's 'withdrawal from physical life,' the nascent organization only received a conditional freedom to practice their religion.

Daidōkyō emerged as Tenrikyō's evangelical message spread nationwide and attracted the attention of the uneasy public. Viewed by government authorities as an antimodern, superstitious religion that potentially undermined loyalty to the imperial state, Tenrikyō nevertheless enjoyed a degree of success that was unprecedented in Japan's modern history in the decade after Miki's death. Under the spiritual leadership of Iburi Izō, whose kamigakari abilities were recognized during Miki's lifetime, Tenrikyō consolidated its authority over

its *kō* as they were reintegrated as branches of Tenrikyō headquarters and initiated its transition into an institutionalized organization. The sociological context in which Daidōkyō appeared illustrates the state was deeply involved the regulation of religious groups. In Tenrikyō's case, state enforcement over the religious market in Japan came to a peak with the Secret Directives, which were specifically geared toward suppressing the growth and influence of the new religion.

The Mizu-yashiki represented a situation where two prophets competed for the charismatic leadership of Miki's movement. In the aftermath of the changes that were forced upon Tenrikyō following the enactment of the Secret Directives, Iida Iwajirō asserted that replacing the *mamori-fuda* as objects of worship enshrined in branch churches and adherents' homes with sacred mirrors brought displeasure to Miki and her kami. While for Iwajirō the theological issue at stake was the official *shintai* of Tenrikyō churches, Izō considered Iwajirō's claims that the kami would abandon 'the Residence of Origin' for the Mizu-yashiki defied Miki's nonnegotiable tenet of the supremacy of the Jiba over all other sacred space. Iwajirō was able to maintain the loyalty of the majority of his Heian congregation and appeal to members of other branch churches through the practical benefits obtained from the sacred water of his well but was expelled by the Tenrikyō leadership for turning his back on the Jiba headquarters.

The schism between Tenrikyō and Daidōkyō can be partly attributed to a disagreement over Miki's designation of Iwajirō as *ninsoku (no) yashiro*. The religious implication of his title has been interpreted differently by the two traditions. While Daidōkyō felt the title was Miki's prediction that Iwajirō would eventually become a 'Shrine of Tsuki-Hi' as Miki was, Tenrikyō completely rejects the notion the designation *ninsoku (no) yashiro* refers to a person with

potential to become a prophet. It is notable that Tenrikyō is consistent in this stance with Ueda Naraito, the successor to Izō as the agent who bestowed Sazuke to Tenrikyō adherents, as Naraito is not considered by Tenrikyō today to have inherited Miki's and Izō's kamigakari abilities. In the Mizu-yashiki jiken both Tenrikyō and Daidōkyō came to the point where they no longer tolerated the chasm between their developing self-definitions on the significance of the designation of *ninsoku* (*no*) *yashiro*. As long as Izō refused to acknowledge Iwajirō's claims, his struggle for greater authority within the ecclesiastical order was an empty attempt that led to his removal as the head of Heian Shikyōkai.

Following the deaths of the Izō and Iwajirō in 1907, the Tenrikyō ministers created the account of Iwajirō's derogatory claim that the headquarters was the 'Residence of Fire' that was soteriologically inferior to his Mizu-yashiki. By raising the stakes of Iwajirō's violation of the doctrine of the Jiba, later theologians are able to render him in current Tenrikyō accounts as a false prophet and his schismatic organization as a distorted version of Miki's teachings. The rewritten account also obscured the issue at stake from Iwajirō's perspective, and also prevented other would-be 'schemers' to adopt the Mizu-yashiki rhetoric that the 'ignorance' or the 'impoverished worldliness' (*sekainami*) of Tenrikyō officials prompted the kami to 'leave the Jiba.'

In the events building up to the emergence of the Tenri Kenkyūkai (Honmichi) in the early Shōwa period, Iburi Izō continued to show a degree of compromise with government authorities as the church leadership repeatedly petitioned the Home Ministry to become an independent Kyōha Shintō organization. However, because Kyōha Shintō functioned as a state-sanctioned vehicle to educate the populace and to build allegiance toward the emperor, Kyōha Shintō groups were closely scrutinized and had to answer to officials

from the Home and Education Ministries (Inoue N. 2002, 412). As a result, Tenrikyō leadership was prompted to accede to tennōist ideology and eschew elements from Miki's original teachings if not in practice, at least on a superficial level visible to the state.

Izō continued to supervise the direction of the Tenrikyō movement as administrative control of the institution was gradually consolidated under the office of *kanchō* or 'Shinbashira' held by Nakayama Shinnosuke. Adopted in 1882 as heir to the Nakayama family, the youthful Shinnosuke initially commanded little authority and one of Izō's recognized roles was to build upon the foundation of the authoritative office of the Shinbashira. Tenrikyō's current institutional histories depict Izō's tenure as having allowed a smooth transition from his charismatic leadership to a traditional/legal authority. However, the appearance of prophetic figures such as Ibaragi Motoyoshi and Ōnishi Aijirō represented an undercurrent of dissent that arose in the wake of Nakayama Shinnosuke's death in 1914. It appears that for a significant sector of the Tenrikyō membership, it did not sit well with them that a minor essentially held the administrative position of *kanchō* until 1925.

The Tenri Kenkyūkai emerged following Tenrikyō's entrance into its postcharismatic phase when new forms of revelation were no longer sanctioned by the institution. The course of Tenrikyō's institutionalization largely follows the model of the routinization of charisma proposed by Max Weber. Because the innovative qualities of 'pure' charisma essentially undercuts the formation of a status quo and any sustainable economic activity, any successful transition of a 'cult-movement' into a self-sustaining religious organization requires 'pure' charisma to be transformed into binding tenets and structures allowing religious practitioners to make a 'career' out their devotional life. Members who regarded

the presence of a charismatic leader an essential part of their devotional experience directed their commitment to various new self-proclaimed prophets in which Aijirō happened to draw the largest following.

Aijirō asserted that according to the newfound understanding he gained during his kamigakari, the arrival of the human Kanrodai (i.e., Aijirō himself) was predicted by Tenrikyō scriptures. Rather than a religious figure who provided practical benefits, Aijirō instead was an ideological leader who reinterpreted Tenrikyō scripture to introduce the doctrine of the Kanrodai as a prophet figure in addition to a physical marker of sacred space. His ability to 'open the lid' of Tenrikyō scriptures to discover hidden prophecies was later applied to the canon of State Shintō. The Tenri Kenkyūkai held the position that the emperor was an illegitimate ruler who lacked the 'divine virtue' to reign over the nation of Japan. The *Kenkyū Shiryō* asserted that the myths of the *Nihongi* were not historical truths but were prophecies that also preordained the arrival of the human Kanrodai. According to this document, Amaterasu's act of hiding in her cave from Susanoo predicted Nakayama Miki's death. The account of Ninigi no Mikoto descending on Japan with the three imperial regalia in turn was interpreted as a prophecy of Aijirō becoming the human Kanrodai, the only individual who could legitimately claim the divine leadership of the Japanese nation. Aijirō's children Masanori, Yoshinobu, and Aiko were further claimed to be the reincarnations of Iburi Izō and Miki's children Shūji and Kokan. These three children symbolized the imperial regalia that 'Amaterasu' (Miki) entrusted in Aijirō's care in order for him to realize his destiny to become the divine ruler of Japan (NSSS 110-111; 112-114).<sup>112</sup>

---

<sup>112</sup> See de Bary et al. (24-25; 27-28) for an English translation of these myths.

Aijirō's movement actively embraced a vigorous antiestablishment stance, which in part reflected the most revolutionary qualities of Miki's teachings. In the last years of her life Miki asked her followers, "Do you fear God or do you fear the law?" and defiantly resisted the state, which resulted in her numerous detainments in prison. Thus when the government cracked down on Aijirō's movement in 1928 and 1938, this solidified the members' conviction that they were embarking on the 'true' Tenrikyō path. The parent organization, however, was prompted to take drastic measures in that anyone who was known to have visited the Tenri Kenkyūkai was expelled from the organization. This policy on the part of Tenrikyō authorities proved to be extremely effective. When Aijirō's devoted followers reorganized themselves as Tenri Honmichi, many of their renewed missionary efforts directed to Tenrikyō churches were relegated to proselytizing to walls (*kabe-shiki nioi-gake*) because of the overwhelming stigma attached to the heretical organization (Umehara 1975, 155).

Despite of the differing sociological backdrops of each of the three schisms discussed in this study, they all represented a conscious effort by the religious leadership to remove 'heretics' from the religious community. As a rule, expulsion has an essential role in the self-definition process of a religious body. It is a process of elimination that is enacted in order to develop an ideological consensus, and helps unite members by strengthening loyalty and commitment to the parent body.

Each schism represented a point at which the direction of Tenrikyō's normative self-definition was seriously jeopardized. Altogether, the emergence of Tenrikyō, the Tenrin-Ō-Kyōkai, Daidōkyō, and Honmichi all represented a developing self-definition of religiosity that stood in sharp contrast with the

definition the authorities of the imperial state of Japan attempted to impose on the populace. Michael Pye notes,

In recent times, but also beginning in the nineteenth century, the so-called 'new religions' have all pitched their message in various ways to take account of the kind of identity which Japanese people have felt that they have, or felt that they could or should aspire to. Early twentieth century clashes between the state and certain of the new religions may be understood as being the consequence of rival interpretations of the destiny of the Japanese people (1).

Although there were numerous potential pitfalls along Tenrikyō's path toward institutionalization under the strict regulation of the state, the organization was able to overcome the issue of religious dissension in part by adopting the strategy of expelling members who diverged too far from the self-definition developed by its authority figures. As organizations in which members' affiliation with the institution are largely on a voluntary basis, it is impossible for 'new religions' to completely eliminate all sources of potential religious dissent. The best option available to these religions is to limit the amount of damage as much as possible when such dissent arises. I would like to argue that Tenrikyō's expulsion of unauthorized prophet-figures and their adherents represented a strategy of 'damage control' that has been relatively successful toward maintaining consensus and a relative level of stability within the religion.

Though evidence in the *Shinshūkyō jiten* illustrate that Tenrikyō has experienced a number of schisms comparable to Reiyūkai and others, apart from Honmichi, these schisms have proven to be marginal when one takes into consideration the modest membership size of these groups. Despite of evidence pointing to the contrary, Tenrikyō has been able to maintain such an air of



stability that it led Byron Earhart to write “Compared with other New Religions, Tenrikyō has had rather few groups splitting away from it” (1982, 176). The tendency for Tenrikyō schisms to remain small may have attributed to the fact they have thus far eluded attention from outside observers and even most insiders. Even the *Shinshūkyō jiten* does not list any schism from Tenrikyō after 1958 when there have been several new schismatic developments in the last twenty-five years (more on this topic below). As related in this thesis, Miki’s doctrine of the Jiba played an indispensable role in Tenrikyō’s institutionalization, and the *Shinshūkyō jiten* offers the following observation on how the centrality of sacred space in Tenrikyō functions to facilitate cohesiveness in the organization.

In Tenrikyō teachings, the location of the Main Sanctuary of Tenrikyō headquarters in Tenri City, the ‘Jiba,’ is bequeathed with supreme religious significance as the place of human creation as willed by the kami. There is also the mystical ritual known as the ‘Kagura Zutome’ that is only conducted in the headquarters Main Sanctuary. If a member establishes an independent schism, visiting the Main Sanctuary as a regular act of devotion can no longer be a viable option. Though an adherent may be critical of the religious leadership, the possibility of becoming estranged from the principle source of sacred experience cannot help but motivate such an individual to remain in the fold of the religious group (68).

It also helps the institution that the Tenrikyō headquarters has exclusive authority over initiating its members with Sazuke transmissions, training its missionaries, and officially appointing ministers to local congregations. Although the process of appointing ministers and approving construction projects or relocations of branch churches is largely a formality, the fact that the ritual segment of these procedures (*o-hakobi*) are carried out in the Foundress’

Sanctuary (*Kyōsoden* 教祖殿) in the close presence of the ‘everliving’ Miki lends an air of divine authority that can never be replaced by regional ordination outposts. The fact that Tenrikyō limited its training and ordination facilities for missionaries at the Jiba has also been crucial toward maintaining stability. The regulation of recruitment is considered as an essential step in the routinization process (Weber 1968, 58). In Tenrikyō, the most important recruiting and training procedures such as the Besseki lectures, Sazuke transmissions, the three-month ‘Spiritual Development Course’ for potential missionaries (*Shūyōka*) and the Head Minister Qualification Course (*Kentei Kōshū*) are all only available at the Jiba.

This study was a modest attempt to inquire into the factors that played into Tenrikyō’s emergence as a formidable religious organization in the late nineteenth and early twentieth centuries. One of my main regrets is that I was unable to gain access to Tenrikyō sources from the early Shōwa period. Thus there was no serious attempt on my part to discuss the development of heretical discourse in Tenrikyō. Any such study of Tenrikyō heresiology would not be complete without a thorough examination of Tenrikyō literature contemporary with the emergence of the Tenri Kenyūkai.

As far I am able to infer, however, Miki’s compositions—the *Mikagura-uta* and *Ofudesaki*—appear to lack any terminology that denotes ‘heresy’ and it is questionable whether the concept developed in any form during her lifetime. The first account of the Sukezō jiken was not written until 1898, more than thirty years after the incident occurred and eleven years after Miki’s passing. This account (written by Nakayama Shinnosuke) refers to the incident as a ‘*mōsetsu*’

妄説 (fallacy or deluded view) and portrays Sukezō as someone who deceived (*manchaku seshi* 瞞着せし) nearby villagers (OYKH 7A).

On the other hand, there are signs that Tenrikyō began to develop a concept of heresy under the guidance of Iburi Izō. Izō is recorded in the *Osashizu* to have once referred to members of Daidōkyō in Kyushu as '*yamako*' (literally, 'children of the mountain') (Os 5: 3917, Meiji 33 [1900] November 22). The term has a wide array of meanings in several dialects, alluding to a person who works in the mountains as a prospector, one who has a 'speculative disposition' and therefore has the implication of a 'schemer' or a swindler and impostor (Shōgaku Tosho 2: 2465; TJ 914). The term *yamako* was picked up and utilized by Tenrikyō writer Moroi Masaichi (1877-1903) to refer to Sukezō. Second Shinbashira Nakayama Shōzen noted the common use of this word and also labeled the Sukezō jiken as '*bunpa/beppa sayō*' 分派作用・別派作用 or literally 'creation of a religious schism or faction' (1999, 195). As for the terms *itan* and *isetsu*, I suspect Matsumura Kichitarō was the first individual to use the terms in his autobiography first published in 1950. It is probable that Matsumura came across these terms while he was in direct contact with nativists and other religionists during Tenrikyō's efforts to become an independent Kyōha Shintō sect in the 1900s. It is worthy to note that while Matsumura refers to the Mizuyashiki and Ibaragi incidents as *itan-isetsu*, he did not use the terms when he wrote on the Tenri Kenkyūkai. Matsumura instead denounced Ōnishi Aijirō for inciting the *lèse-majesté* incident (*fukey jiken*) by distorting the message of the *Ofudesaki* and *Osashizu* to promote his own interests (*gaden insui*, literally, drawing water into one's own field) (357).

Recent Tenrikyō authors have characterized heresy as a type of treason or rebellion (*muhon*), a cognitive deficiency, and a sign of a person's lack of sincerity and devotion. Nakajima Hideo and Serizawa Shigeru are among a number of theologians who use the term '*garyū shinkō*:' a 'self-styled' or 'self-serving' faith. With the exception of Iida Teruaki, the discourse on heresy in Tenrikyō texts and articles is rarely rendered as a soteriological failure that is evident in the discourse of Jōdo Shinshū priests.

Among other regrets, it is unfortunate that I was unable to obtain a primary source from Daidōkyō. Among the shortcomings of this study include that fact that information contained in the first two chapters was mainly gathered from Tenrikyō primary sources while the third chapter is greatly dependent on secondary materials on Honmichi.

As for potential areas of future research, a larger survey could consider the question whether schisms from Tenrikyō are in a way compelled to reject the doctrine of the Jiba since it is so closely tied with the authority of Tenrikyō headquarters. A comprehensive look into the recent fortunes of Daidōkyō and Honmichi would also be welcomed. It would be interesting to discover how Daidōkyō currently views the Tenrikyō institution and if Nakayama Miki has a significant role in their understanding of their religious history.

In Honmichi's case, it is clear that they consider Nakayama Miki as their Foundress (*gokyōso-sama*). Unsurprisingly, their stance against the Tenrikyō institution is unabashedly critical. Although the only Honmichi primary source I was able to gain access to, the *Honmichi gaikan*, does not explicitly refer to Tenrikyō as a 'heresy,' its discourse on the organization characterizes Tenrikyō as an 'unauthentic' version of Miki's teachings. The text asserts Honmichi "is not Tenrikyō," that Miki referred to her teachings as "this path" (*kono michi*) or

simply “the path” (*omichi*) and that the name ‘Tenrikyō’ only came into being following its independence from the Shintō Honkyoku in 1908 (HG 148). Tenrikyō is instead a “digressing path” (*yokomichi*) (*ibid.* 181). The text further refers to Tenrikyō as “godless” (*kami-sama go-fuzai*) for rejecting all revelation after the death of Iburi Izō, and characterizes its doctrine as hollow and empty as there no one in the leadership who understands the meaning of Izō’s timely talks (*ibid.* 169; 244).

The authors of the *Honmichi gaikan* reserve their most severe criticism against Tenrikyō leaders who succumbed to state pressure. An example is as follows:

Fearing persecution, not only did Tenrikyō headquarters burn the *Ofudesaki*, cut out portions of the *Mikagura-uta*, and make the *Osashizu* into material for cardboard, they cooperated in the great war and lost sight of their single-hearted devotion to the kami (*ibid.* 266).

On top of attacking the contents of the Meiji Kyōten and of Nakayama Shōzen’s Instruction Eight that urged ministers to eschew all mention of the *Doroumi Kōki* cosmogony, the *Honmichi gaikan* authors compare the Tenrikyō institution to the hidden Christians of the Tokugawa period who stepped on the *fumi-e* while identifying Honmichi with the Christians who refused to defile the sacred image of the Christ (*ibid.* 216-220; 223). Upon feeling vindicated by the defeat of the imperial army in World War II, Honmichi shows a degree of triumphalism by claiming,

One can imagine there are innocent followers within Tenrikyō’s ranks who sincerely devote themselves to [Miki’s] path and are unaware of the errors made by ecclesiastical officials. We ought to be convinced that the day will come in the near future when these people will convert to the True Path (*ibid.* 170).

Although the *Honmichi gaikan* relates how Tenrikyō leadership derided ‘Kanrodai-sama’ Ōnishi Aijirō for his heretical teachings and Honmichi as “a movement that aimed its arrows against Tenrikyō headquarters” (*ibid.* 71), the language of the work as a whole implicitly argues that the true ‘heresy’ is not Honmichi, but Tenrikyō.

It is also worthy to mention that Aijirō’s innovative doctrine of the human Kanrodai also inspired defectors from his movement to make the same claim. The vast majority of Tenrikyō’s indirect schisms are those from the Tenri Kenkyūkai and all their leaders continue to base their legitimacy on the premise they are the new ‘human Kanrodai’ for the current age (SJ 68-74). Aijirō successfully prevented further schisms from occurring until his death by promising that he would perpetually be reborn in the Ōnishi family. By making such a declaration, Honmichi has thus far only experienced one schism—Honbushin, founded by his daughter Ōnishi Tama in 1962—following his death. Aijirō’s claim that he will continually be reborn to return as the leader of Honmichi essentially is a revised approach to the hereditary solution to the issue of succession. Yet the doctrine of the continual transmigration of the soul of Ōnishi Aijirō may prove to be destabilizing for Honmichi following the death of the current ‘Kanrodai-sama’ Ōnishi Yasuhiko (1960- ). Yasuhiko is known to have at least fifteen siblings (Umehara 1977, 16), which almost is a recipe guaranteeing countless contentious family power struggles over the authority of the organization in the distant future.

It is safe to say that Sukezō’s movement is now defunct, as his residence is no longer standing. Though it may be entirely possible the group has relocated to another place, Sukezō’s *honji* is presently an empty grass field littered with

two dilapidated tombstones. However, the headquarters of the schism initiated by Sukezō's younger brother Imai Sōjirō 今井惣次郎, Tenrin-Ō-Kyō 転輪王教, is within walking distance from this desolate scene. Tenrin-Ō-Kyō claims that the kami Tenrin-Ō-no-Mikoto entered the body of Sōjirō on the fifth day of the tenth month in 1867 and announced, "I am Tenrin-Ō-no-Mikoto. I am the original kami that created this world and humankind. From now I wish to enter into Sōjirō of this place and work to save the masses." (Sounds familiar!) This obscure religious group appears to have its own set of scriptures and potentially represents a doctrinal time capsule that offers a glimpse into the cosmology of the Tenrin-Ō-Kyōkai and that of Tenrikyō in its nascent stage.<sup>113</sup>

Finally, a quick survey into the most recent schismatic developments from Tenrikyō suggests that, unlike the examples offered in this present study, the role of kamigakari in legitimizing their emergence is unclear. The only recent schism with explicit claims to a figure with transcendental knowledge appears to reveal the soteriological concerns in alleviating the suffering experienced by deceased individuals (*mitama*) unable to return to the cycle of rebirth.<sup>114</sup> This example may indicate that kamigakari phenomena is not on the decline in schismatic movements emerging from Tenrikyō but is undergoing a transformation similar to what has been observed in 'Japanese shamanism' in general (Hardacre 1996, 217).

Tenmeian 天命庵, founded by Daitokuji Teruaki 大徳寺昭輝 (born Itō Yukinaga 伊藤幸長 in 1963), represents a group whose emergence was facilitated by the works of Serizawa Kōjirō. In his youth Daitokuji caught the attention of

---

<sup>113</sup> Most of the information in this paragraph comes from a signboard located at the site.

<sup>114</sup> Unfortunately, I have not been able to confirm the name of this group.

the novelist and he subsequently appeared in Serizawa's novels (specifically the eight volume *Kami siriizu* or 'Kami series'). Serizawa wrote that the young man was the reincarnation of Nakayama Shinnosuke and that Miki had entered and lived in the young man's belly since he was eighteen years of age. Serizawa further related that Miki would occasionally give oracles through Daitokuji's lips. Yasui Mikio, an instructor at the Tenri Seminary, has since insisted that Daitokuji's so-called revelations were nothing but an act cultivated from the skills he gained as a drama school student (1989, 69-71). Daitokuji had completed the Spiritual Development Course and Head Minister Qualification Course in 1982 and was officially expelled in 1992. Daitokuji has more recently concentrated his efforts toward promoting cultural activities such as calligraphy and traditional Japanese dance. Although Tenmeian is not a legal religious corporation, Daitokuji holds monthly assemblies to dance the *Mikagura-uta* liturgy and occasionally sponsors a ritual closely resembling the Kagura Service.

The Ichinomoto Bunsho Hozonkai 襟本分署保存会 was founded by Yashima Hideo 八島英雄, a former lecturer of Tenri University and head minister of a Tenrikyō branch church in Tokyo. Yashima roundly criticized Tenrikyō headquarters for no longer including the old Ichinomoto Police Station where Miki suffered her final detainment in an annual tour for Tenri University students that visited important sites related to the life of Tenrikyō's Foundress. Yashima seems to have desired Tenrikyō headquarters to preserve the Ichinomoto Police Station in the same manner the grounds of the old Nara Police Station where Miki was once detained was made into the site of Tenrikyō Umetani Daikyōkai.



Accounts differ over whether Yashima left the Tenrikyō organization voluntarily or whether he was expelled (Kaneko 1987, 282). Nevertheless, Yashima's work *Nakayama Miki kenkyū nōto* ('Research notes on Nakayama Miki') represents his attempt to write a scholarly critique on the official hagiography of Tenrikyō's Foundress. Among other theological claims, Yashima asserted that Miki's teachings allowed the possibility of multiple Jibas to exist, and that Kanrodai pillars ought to be erected at each church. Yashima further portrays Shūji and Shinnosuke as evil conspirators who utilized Miki's religious activities for their financial gain, which appears to be an effort to undermine the foundation of Tenrikyō's institutional authority. Tenrikyō's response to Yashima included a special issue of *Arakitōryō*, the Tenrikyō Young Men's Association quarterly, in the fall of 1987. The issue included an extensive article that meticulously countered Yashima's claims one by one. When one takes into consideration that the fall 1987 issue of *Arakitōryō* was over two hundred pages longer than the typical issue, this suggests that Yashima's work was considered a serious challenge by church officials.<sup>115</sup> Yashima's movement has been relatively quiet until the publication of an article in the April 29, 2004 issue of a popular Japanese weekly in which he claimed that one of Tenrikyō's 'precious treasures'—a menacing-looking wooden sculpture supposedly based on Miki's emaciated appearance following her long detainment at the Ichinomoto Prison—was in the possession of an individual unrelated to the institution (Inoue A. 2004). Also, an extended legal battle presently ensues over the right of a particular church from Tokyo now belonging to Yashima's group from continuing the use of 'Tenrikyō' in their name. Although the parent organization

---

<sup>115</sup> See Iida (1991, 491-556), Kaneko (1987), KNH, and Tenrikyō Seinenkai Kyōgaku Kenkyū Yūshikai as examples of Tenrikyō authors' responses to Yashima's work.

initially won a court case that prevented this church from presenting itself as a Tenrikyō branch church, the decision was recently overturned.

Last but not least, Omichi おみち is a religious group that has only emerged in the last year, and its adherents claim the *Ofudesaki* predicts future events and focuses their efforts toward studying its hidden prophecies. The group also largely eschews the performance of the *Mikagura-uta* liturgy. Although it is still unclear whether Omichi's leader Fukutome Shūji 福留修司 claims himself to be a prophet-figure or not, this last example hints that the appeal of 'opening the lid' to reveal the so-called hidden truths of Tenrikyō scripture still resonates long after Ōnishi Aijirō's death.

Each of these recent schisms potentially offer new perspectives that further relate to the issues of legitimate authority, charisma, and sacred space in Tenrikyō. Although it is difficult to make any conclusive remarks on Omichi due to a lack of information, one could imagine that the charismatic ability of being able to discover hidden revelations is highly valued by its members and would be a 'skill' likely to be found among the group's leaders. In the case of Tenmeian, Serizawa Kōjirō's novels claimed that the 'everliving Foundress' Miki spoke through Daitokuji Teruaki, who spoke in a woman's voice with a Kansai accent. With the exposure he gained through Serizawa's works, Daitokuji attracted a following that included Tenrikyō ministers and their successors, which subsequently led to his expulsion. Yashima Hideo's group, the Ichinomoto Bunsho Hozonkai, on the other hand, attempts to present itself as rational critics of the Tenrikyō institution. Rather than depending on a source of new revelation, Yashima centers the appeal of his movement with claims he has

discovered through his research the ‘real’ details of historical events in Miki’s life.

Concerning the issue of sacred space, Yashima’s movement presents the clearest violation of the Tenrikyō tenet surrounding the Jiba. His doctrine that claims Miki taught a doctrine that allowed for the establishment of multiple Jibas challenges the Tenrikyō orthodox position that the Kanrodai marks the location of human creation or the ‘Home of the Parent’ (*Oyasato*) where the divine name of God the Parent was bestowed. Although Serizawa and Daitokuji make no similar claims that seek to lessen the sanctity of the Jiba, Tenrikyō theologians’ attacks on Tenmeian suggest otherwise. Theologians who have confronted Tenmeian in writing all seem to point out that the ‘everliving’ Miki lives at the Jiba, and that even the suggestion that she would speak anywhere else (not to mention that she could speak at all following the death of her mouthpiece Iburi Izō) was absurd. To elaborate, theologian Iida Teruaki writes, “The suggestion that our Foundress would depart from the Jiba and appear as a young man speaking in a woman’s voice is utter fantasy, truly a figment of the imagination, and a complete fabrication” (1989, 88).<sup>116</sup> In the same way, just the fact that Omichi members emphasize the study of the *Ofudesaki* to discover hidden prophecies at the expense of other practices—for instance, making pilgrimages to Jiba—could potentially be viewed by Tenrikyō leadership as a violation of the orthodox doctrine of sacred space.

In terms of legitimate authority, Omichi presents an interesting case in that the name comes from an informal term (simply meaning ‘the path’) used by Tenrikyō adherents to refer to their faith system or to the religious organization

---

<sup>116</sup> Refer to Iida (1991, 445-490) for the theologian’s extended critique of Serizawa Kōjirō’s work.

in general. The emergence of this new religious corporation that has made moves to recruit Tenrikyō followers prompted a response from the ecclesiastical authority to warn its ministers of this recent development in church meetings and publications.<sup>117</sup>

In the case of Tenmeian, according to a Tenrikyō source, Daitokuji also bestowed sacraments such as the Sazuke of the Fan, Sazuke of Breath, and Sazuke of Sacred Water (Imamura 62). With this action, not only does Daitokuji supercede the authority of the Shinbashira, the only individual of Tenrikyō Church Headquarters who is permitted to offer these charismatic transmissions, Daitokuji also offered forms of Sazuke that were only available during either Miki's or Izō's lifetime. Lastly, both Serizawa and Yashima are criticized by Tenrikyō authors for refuting Miki's divinity which she gained upon becoming the 'Shrine of Tsuki-Hi' in late 1838. To elaborate, Yashima claims that anyone who devotes their lives to God's path is a 'Shrine of Tsuki-Hi.' This is an obvious violation of Tenrikyō orthodoxy that maintains that only Miki could ever hold this title, as the examples of Iida Iwajirō and Ueda Naraito previously showed. Serizawa is criticized in Tenrikyō texts for suggesting that Miki continued to be 'trained' by God following her 'withdrawal from physical life' (Kaneko 1992, 32). Such a suggestion by Serizawa rejects what can be called the 'original charisma' of Miki, where she is not only considered the 'Shrine of Tsuki-Hi,' but is the

---

<sup>117</sup> The following notice was published in the July 2004 issue of *Michi no tomo*:  
May 25, 2004

Notice to all Tenrikyō members,

Name: Religious corporation 'Omichi'; Executive representative Fukutome Shūji

Location: 9-1-2 chōme Nakayamadai Ka'ai-chō Kita-Katsuragi-gun, Nara-ken

It has come to the attention of this department that the above mentioned religious corporation 'Omichi' has recently been presenting itself as a religious group associated with Tenrikyō and soliciting Yōboku [i.e., recipients of the Sazuke] and Tenrikyō followers.

The above religious group is a group that has absolutely nothing to do with Tenrikyō. We would like to inform everyone of this fact and urge utmost caution regarding this matter.

Tenrikyō General Administration Department

Parent of the *hinagata* ('exemplary path,' often rendered as 'the Divine Model' in English) and the 'everliving Foundress' who continues to wait for all her children to 'return' to Jiba. (These three doctrines together are known in the tradition as *Oyasama no o-tachiba* or the 'roles' or the 'statuses' of the Tenrikyō Foundress.) The theological discourse that appears in critiques against these recent 'heresies' all attempt to solidify the legitimacy of Tenrikyo Church Headquarters as the institution that has inherited Miki's routinized charisma. Theologians implicitly pose the following question to their readers: Can you trust the words of a novelist and occasional critic of the Tenrikyō institution (i.e., Serizawa) or a disgruntled ex-instructor of Tenri University (i.e., Yashima) over the sacred institution that has taken up her cause of universal salvation? For the majority of Tenrikyō followers, the answer appears to be a resounding no. To this writer, this is an indication that demonstrates that Tenrikyō represents an example of a religion that has successfully institutionalized itself following the routinization of the charisma of its founder Nakayama Miki and through its emphasis on the centrality of sacred space.

— Bibliography —

- Ammerman, Nancy T. 1987. "Schism: An Overview." In *The Encyclopedia of Religion* / editor in chief Mircea Eliade; edited by Charles J. Adams et al. New York: Macmillan, 13: 98-102.
- Andelson, Jonathan G. 1980. "Routinization of Behavior in a Charismatic Leader." *American Ethnologist* 7 no. 4 (November 1980), 716-733.
- Aochi Shin. 1970 [1968]. *Tenrikyō: hyakusanjū-nenme no shinkō kakumei*. Tokyo: Kōbundō.
- \_\_\_\_\_. 1974 [1972]. "Tenri no hangyakusha." In *Henkakuki no shūkyō* / edited by Maruyama Teruo. Tokyo: Dentō to Genzaisha, 226-244.
- Arai, Ken. 1981 [1972]. "New Religious Movements." In *Japanese Religion: A Survey by the Agency for Cultural Affairs* / edited by Hori Ichirō and Ikado Fujio et al. Tokyo/Palo Alto: Kodansha International, 89-104.
- Arakitōryō Henshūbu. 1994. "Tokushū: kyōgaku no susume." *Arakitōryō* 177 (Fall 1994), 18-19.
- \_\_\_\_\_. 2002. "Oyasama go-nensai o moto ni kyōshi o furikaeru, daiichibu: Oyasama ichinensai kara Oyasama sanjū nensai made." *Arakitōryō* 209 (Fall 2002), 8-71.
- \_\_\_\_\_. 2003a. "Oyasama go-nensai o moto ni kyōshi o furikaeru, dainibu: Oyasama yonjū nensai kara Oyasama gojū nensai made." *Arakitōryō* 210 (Winter 2003), 18-73.
- \_\_\_\_\_. 2003b. "Kyōkai no seiritsu ni kansuru Oyagamisama no oboshimeshi ni tsuite." *Arakitōryō* 210 (Winter 2003), 76-97.
- \_\_\_\_\_. 2003c. "Keiji no keishō ni tsuite." *Arakitōryō* 210 (Winter 2003), 98-111.
- \_\_\_\_\_. 2003d. "Harigabessho kara ojiba e no michi." *Arakitōryō* 211 (Spring 2003), 88-95.
- Baroni, Helen L. 1994. "Bottled Anger: Episodes in Ōbaku Conflict in the Tokugawa Period." *Japanese Journal of Religious Studies* 21 nos. 2-3 (June-September 1994), 191-210.
- \_\_\_\_\_. 2000. *Obaku Zen: The Emergence of the Third Sect of Zen in Tokugawa Japan*. Honolulu: University of Hawai'i Press.
- Becker, Carl B. 1986 [1979]. "Concepts and Roles of God in Tenrikyo." In *The Theological Perspectives of Tenrikyo: In Commemoration of the Centennial Anniversary of Oyasama* / edited by Oyasato Research Institute, Tenri University. Tenri: Tenri University Press, 473-500.
- \_\_\_\_\_. 1990. "Religious Healing in 19th Century 'New Religions': The Cases of Tenrikyo and Christian Science." *Religion* 20 (July 1990), 199-215.

- Blacker, Carmen. 1971. "Millenarian Aspects of the New Religions of Japan." In *Tradition and Modernization in Japanese Culture* / edited by Donald H. Shively. Princeton, NJ: Princeton University Press, 563-600.
- . 1999 [1975]. *The Catalpa Bow: A Study of Shamanistic Practices in Japan*. Richmond, Surrey: Japan Library.
- Bromley, David G. and Hammond, Phillip E., ed. 1987. *The Future of New Religious Movements*. Macon, GA: Mercer University Press.
- Clarke, Peter B., ed. 1999. *Bibliography of Japanese New Religions, with Annotations and an Introduction to Japanese New Religions at Home and Abroad*. Richmond, Surrey: Japan Library.
- Constas, Helen. 1958. "Max Weber's Two Conceptions of Bureaucracy." *The American Journal of Sociology* 63 no. 4 (January 1958), 400-409.
- Cornille, Catherine. 1998. "Canon Formation in New Religious Movements: The Case of the Japanese New Religions." In *Canonization and Decanonization* / edited by A. van der Kooij and K. van der Toorn. Leiden/Boston: E J Brill, 279-291.
- . 1999. "Nationalism in New Japanese Religions." *Nova Religio* 2 no. 2 (April 1999), 228-244.
- Davis, Winston. 1983. "Pilgrimage and World Renewal: A Study of Religion and Social Values in Tokugawa Japan, part I." *History of Religions* 23 no. 2 (November 1983), 97-116.
- . 1984. "Pilgrimage and World Renewal: A Study of Religion and Social Values in Tokugawa Japan, part II." *History of Religions* 23 no. 3 (February 1984), 197-221.
- . 1989. "Book Review (A Theory of Religion by Stark, Rodney and Bainbridge, William Sims)." *Journal of Religion* 69 no. 2, 287-288.
- . 1992. *Japanese Religion and Society: Paradigms of Structure and Change*. Albany: State University of New York Press.
- Dawson, Lorne L. 1998. *Comprehending Cults: The Sociology of New Religious Movements*. Don Mills, Ontario: Oxford University Press Canada.
- de Bary, Theodore, et al. 2001. *Sources of Japanese Tradition (Volume One): From Earliest Times to 1600* (second edition). New York: Columbia University Press.
- Dexinger, Ferdinand. 1981. "Limits of Tolerance in Judaism: The Samaritan Example." In *Jewish and Christian Self-Definition*, vol. 2 / edited by E. P. Sanders. Philadelphia: Fortress Press, 88-114.
- Dobbins, James C. 1980. "The Concept of Heresy in the Jōdo Shinshū." *Transactions of the International Conference of Orientalists in Japan* 25, 33-46.
- . 1998. "Envisioning Kamakura Buddhism." In *Re-Visioning Kamakura Buddhism* / edited by Richard Karl Payne. Honolulu: University of Hawai'i Press, 24-42.

- \_\_\_\_\_. 2002 [1989]. *Jōdo Shinshū: Shin Buddhism in Medieval Japan*. Honolulu: University of Hawai'i Press.
- Earhart, H. Byron. 1982. *Japanese Religion: Unity and Diversity* (third edition). Belmont, CA: Wadsworth Publishing Co.
- \_\_\_\_\_. 1983. *The New Religions of Japan: A Bibliography of Western-Language Materials*. Ann Arbor: Center for Japanese Studies, The University of Michigan.
- Ellwood, Robert S. 1978. *Introducing Religion: From Inside and Outside*. Englewood Cliffs, NJ: Prentice-Hall.
- \_\_\_\_\_. 1982. *Tenrikyo, a Pilgrimage Faith: The Structure and Meanings of a Modern Japanese religion*. Tenri: Oyasato Research Institute.
- Finke, Roger and Stark, Rodney. 2001. "The New Holy Clubs: Testing Church-to-Sect Propositions." *Sociology of Religion* 62 no. 2 (Summer 2001), 175-189.
- Fitzgerald, Timothy. 2000. *The Ideology of Religious Studies*. New York: Oxford University Press.
- Fukaya Tadamasa. 1978 [1962]. *A Commentary on the Mikagura-uta, the Songs for the Tsutome* (revised edition). Tenri: Tenrikyo Overseas Department.
- \_\_\_\_\_. 1989 [1958]. *Kyōri kenkyū: moto no ri* (revised edition/seventh printing). Tenri: Tenrikyō Dōyūsha.
- \_\_\_\_\_. 1995 [1956]. *Mikagura-uta kōgi* (revised edition/ninth printing). Tenri: Tenrikyō Dōyūsha.
- \_\_\_\_\_, ed. 1987 [1974]. *Jijō satoshi* (second edition). Tenri: Tenrikyō Dōyūsha.
- Gluck, Carol. 1985. *Japan's Modern Myths: Ideology in the Late Meiji Period*. Princeton, NJ: Princeton University Press.
- Grapard, Allan G. 1984. "Japan's Ignored Cultural Revolution: The Separation of Shintō and Buddhist Divinities in Meiji (*shinbutsu bunri*) and a Case Study: Tōnomine." *History of Religions* 23 no. 3 (February 1984), 240-265.
- Greene, Daniel Crosby. 1895. "Tenrikyō, or the Teaching of the Heavenly Reason." *Transactions of the Asiatic Society of Japan* 23 no. 5, 24-74.
- Groszos-Ooms, Emily. 1993. *Women and Millenarian Protest in Meiji Japan: Deguchi Nao and Ōmotokyō*. Ithaca, NY: East Asia Program, Cornell University.
- Hardacre, Helen. 1986a. *Kurozumikyō and the New Religions of Japan*. Princeton, NJ: Princeton University Press.
- \_\_\_\_\_. 1986b. "Creating State Shintō: The Great Promulgation Campaign and the New Religions." *Journal of Japanese Studies* 12 no. 1 (Winter 1986), 29-63.
- \_\_\_\_\_. 1989. *Shintō and the State, 1868-1988*. Princeton, NJ: Princeton University Press.
- \_\_\_\_\_. 1994. "Conflict between Shugendō and the New Religions of Bakumatsu Japan." *Japanese Journal of Religious Studies* 21 (June-September 1994), 137-166.



- \_\_\_\_\_. 1996. "Shinmeiaishinkai and the Study of Shamanism in Contemporary Japanese Religious Life." In *Religion in Japan: Arrows to Heaven and Earth* / edited by P.F. Kornicki and I.J. McMullen. New York: University of Cambridge Press, 198-219.
- \_\_\_\_\_. 2002. *Religion and Society in Nineteenth-Century Japan: A Study of the Southern Kantō Region, Using Late Edo and Early Meiji Gazetteers*. Ann Arbor: Center of Japanese Studies, The University of Michigan.
- Hatakama Kazuhiro. 1991a [1989]. "Yoshida-ke no Yamato-guni no shinshoku shihai to Tenrikyō." In *Oyasama to sono jidai: Tenrikyō shi no shūhen o yomu*. Tenri: Tenrikyō Dōyūsha, 105-136.
- \_\_\_\_\_. 1991b [1990]. "Ōsei fukko/shinbutsu bunri to Tenrikyō: Meiji shichi-nen made no Tenrikyō no shūhen jijō." In *Oyasama to sono jidai: Tenrikyō shi no shūhen o yomu*. Tenri: Tenrikyō Dōyūsha, 193-217.
- \_\_\_\_\_. 2002. "Society and Tenrikyō During the Meiji Period." *Tenri Journal of Religion* 30 (March 2002), 83-103.
- Hayasaka Masaaki. 1984. "Issues Surrounding the Official Recognition of the Religious Organizations of Tenrikyō and Konkōkyō." *Tenri Journal of Religion* 18 (October 1984), 87-112.
- \_\_\_\_\_. 1987. "Tenrikyo Under the Structure of National Shintoism: Double-faced Aspects in the Development of Tenrikyo Doctrine During the Lifetime of the Foundress." *Tenri Journal of Religion* 21 (December 1987), 9-38.
- \_\_\_\_\_. 1991 [1983]. "Kokka Shintō taiseika ni okeru Tenrikyō-dan: Oyasama zaise-ki no kyōgi tenkai ni miru nimen-sei ni tsuite." In *Oyasama to sono jidai: Tenrikyō shi no shūhen o yomu*. Tenri: Tenrikyō Dōyūsha, 137-176.
- Holtom, Daniel C. 1965 [1938]. *The National Faith of Japan: A Study in Modern Shintō*. New York: Paragon Book Reprint Corp.
- Honmichi Kyōgibu. 1972. *Honmichi gaikan* (HG). Osaka: Honmichi Kyōgibu.
- Hori Ichirō and Ikado Fujio et al., eds. 1981 [1972]. *Japanese Religion: A Survey by the Agency for Cultural Affairs*. Tokyo/Palo Alto: Kodansha International.
- Hori Yoshizō, ed. 1916. *Dai Nihon jīin sōran*. Tokyo: Meiji Shuppansha.
- Iburi Toshihiko and Hiraki Kazuo. 1996. *Taidan, hyakunichi no Osashizu*. Tenri: Tenrikyō Dōyūsha.
- Iida Teruaki. 1982. "Shūmatsu shisō to Tenrikyō no kyūsaikan." *Arakitōryō* 128 (Summer 1982), 58-69.
- \_\_\_\_\_. 1989. "Fikushon ni yoru waikyoku: Serizawa sanbusaku no baai." *Arakitōryō* 156 (Summer 1989), 84-112.
- \_\_\_\_\_. 1991. *Omichi no benshō: gokyōron e no kokoromi*. Tenri: Iida Teruaki.
- Imai Hideo. 1991. "Tenrikyō ni miru seitō to itan." *G-TEN* 60 (March 1991), 66-72.

- Imamura Toshizō. 1992. "Saikin no itanteki dōkō ni tsuite." *Michi no tomo* 102 no. 12 (December 1992), 62-63.
- Inoue Akio. 1986. "'Furusato' no sōshitsu kara sōzō e." *G-TEN* 7 (February 1986), 75-80.
- . 2004. "Gūzō sūhai to Oyasama zonmei no ri." *Glocal Tenri* 5 no. 6 (June 2004), 1.
- Inoue, Akio and Eynon, Matthew. 1987. *A Study of the Ofudesaki: The Original Scripture of Tenrikyo*. Tenri: Tenrikyo Doyusha.
- Inoue Nobutaka. 1991. *Kyōha Shintō no keisei*. Tokyo: Kōbundō.
- . 2000. *Contemporary Japanese Religion*. Tokyo: Foreign Press Center/Japan.
- . 2002. "The Foundation of Sect Shinto in Modernizing Japan" / translated by Mark Teeuwen. *Japanese Journal of Religious Studies* 29, nos. 3-4 (Fall 2002) 405-427.
- et al., eds. 1990. *Shinshūkyō jiten* (SJ). Tokyo: Kōbundō.
- et al., eds. 1996. *Shinshūkyō kyōdan jinbutsu jiten* (SKJJ). Tokyo: Kōbundō.
- Jaffe, Richard M. 2001. *Neither Monk nor Layman: Clerical Marriage in Modern Japanese Buddhism*. Princeton, NJ: Princeton University Press.
- Johnson, Benton. 1987. "A Sociologist of Religion Looks at the Future of New Religious Movements." In *The Future of New Religious Movements* / edited by David G. Bromley and Phillip E. Hammond. Macon, GA: Mercer University Press, 251-260.
- Kajiyama Kiyoharu. 1997. *Tenrikyō to bungakusha: hitotsu no Tenrikyō kansatsu shi*. Tenri: Tenri Yamato Bunka Kaigi.
- Kaneko Tadashi. 1987. "Yugamerareta Oyasama to oshie." *Arakitōryō* 149 (Fall 1987), 282-305.
- . 1992. "'Oyasama' sairin o tadasu: Itō Yukinaga/Serizawa Kōjirō o megutte." *Arakitōryō* 169 (Fall 1992), 24-35.
- . 1993. "Shinbashira no ri to warera no shinkō." *Arakitōryō* 173 (Fall 1993), 42-49.
- Kano Masanao. 1972. "Yonaoshi no shisō to bunmei kaika." In *Ishin henkaku ni okeru zaisonteki shochōryū* / edited by Kano Masanao and Takagi Shunsuke. Tokyo: San'ichi Shobō, 287-324.
- Kasahara, Kazuo, ed. 2001. *A History of Japanese Religion*. Tokyo: Kosei Publishing Co.
- Katsurajima Nobuhiro. 1992. *Bakumatsu minshū shisō no kenkyū: Bakumatsu kokugaku to minshū shūkyō*. Kyoto: Bunrikaku.
- Kawauchi Takaaki. 2002. "Masuno Michioki no kataru shinjitsu to shinkō: toku ni, Tenri Kyōkō Bekkasei ni taisuru kyōwa ni tsuite." *Tenri kyōkō ronsō* 35, 57-75.
- Kisala, Robert. 1999. *Prophets of Peace: Pacifism and Cultural Identity in Japan's New Religions*. Honolulu: University of Hawai'i Press.

- Kōdansha *Nihon jinmei daijiten* (fourth edition) / edited by Ueda Masaaki et al. 2002. Tokyo: Kōdansha.
- Kokugakuin Daigaku Nihon Bunka Kenkyūjo, ed. 1994. *Shintō jiten*. Tokyo: Kōbundō.
- Kontani Hisanori. 1993. *Shin-Fūfu no hanashi kenkō no hanashi*. Tokyo: Ikeda Shuppan.
- Kuroda Toshio. 1981. "Shinto in the History of Japanese Religion." *Journal of Japanese Studies* 7 (winter 1981), 1-21.
- Langmuir, Gavin I. 1990. *History, Religion, and Antisemitism*. Berkeley: University of California Press.
- Masui Kōshirō. 1970. *Osashizu no tebiki, sono ni*. Tenri: Tenrikyō Dōyūsha.
- \_\_\_\_\_. 1971. *Osashizu no tebiki, sono ichi* (fourth edition). Tenri: Tenrikyō Dōyūsha.
- \_\_\_\_\_. 1994. *Osashizu katari-gusa*, 2 vols. Tenri: Tenrikyō Dōyūsha.
- Masuno Kosetsu zenshū (MKZ), 23 vols. 1929. Tanbaichi, Nara: Masuno Kosetsu Zenshū Kankōkai.
- Matsuda, Taketeru. 1986 [1967]. "The Grant of Safe Childbirth, Obiyayurushi." In *The Theological Perspectives of Tenrikyo: In Commemoration of the Centennial Anniversary of Oyasama* / edited by Oyasato Research Institute, Tenri University. Tenri: Tenri University Press, 261-269.
- Mass, Jeffrey P. 1989. *Lordship and Inheritance in Early Medieval Japan: A Study of the Kamakura Sōryō System*. Stanford, CA: Stanford University Press.
- Matsumura Kichitarō. 1952 [1950]. *Michi no hachijū-nen: Matsumura Kichitarō jiden*. Tanbaichi: Tenrikyō Yōtokusha.
- Matsutani Takekazu. 1987. "Iburi Izō monsho/Nakayama Shinnosuke hisseki 'Okina yori kikishi hanashi' no ikkōsatsu." *Arakitōryō* 149 (Fall 1987), 306-347.
- \_\_\_\_\_. 2001 [1981]. *Senjin no omokage*. Tenri: Tenrikyō Seinenkai Honbu.
- McFarland, H. Neill. 1967. *The Rush Hour of the Gods: A Study of New Religious Movements in Japan*. New York: MacMillan Company.
- Michi no tomo*. 2004. "Tsūchi." *Michi no tomo* 114 no. 7 (July 2004), 75.
- Mikagura-uta* (MKU). In *Yoboku Handbook* (second edition). 1997. Tenri: Tenrikyō Yoboku Association, 2-29.
- Miller, Timothy, ed. 1991. *When Prophets Die: The Postcharismatic Fate of New Religious Movements*. Albany: State University of New York Press.
- Miyake Hitoshi. 1987. "The Influence of Shugendō on New Religions." In *Japanese Buddhism: Its Tradition, New Religions, and Interaction with Christianity* / edited by Minoru Kiyota, assisted by Byron Earhart, Paul Griffiths, and James Heisig. Tokyo/Los Angeles: Buddhist Books International, 71-82.
- \_\_\_\_\_. 1996. *Shugendō to Nihon shūkyō*. Tokyo: Shunjūsha.

- Morishita, Saburo S. 2001. *Teodori: Cosmological Building and Social Consolidation in a Ritual Dance*. Rome: Editrice Pontificia Università Gregoriana.
- Morohashi, Tetsuji. 1991. *Dai kanwa jiten* (second revised edition), vol 7. / edited by Kamata Tadashi and Yoneyama Torataro. Tokyo: Taishūkan Shoten.
- Moroi Masaichi. 2002 [1970]. *Seibun iin shō*. Tenri: Tenrikyō Dōyūsha.
- Mullins, Mark R., Shimazono Susumu, and Swanson, Paul L., eds. 1993. *Religion and Society in Modern Japan: Selected Readings*. Berkeley: Asian Humanities Press, Nanzan Studies in Asian Religions.
- Murakami Shigeyoshi. 1963. *Kindai minshū shūkyō shi no kenkyū (zōtei-han)*. Kyoto: Hōzōkan.
- \_\_\_\_\_. 1974. *Honmichi fukei jiken: tennōsei o taiketsu shita minshū shūkyō*. Tokyo: Kōdansha.
- \_\_\_\_\_. 1975. *Kyōso: kindai Nihon no shūkyō kaikakusha tachi*. Tokyo: Yomiuri Shinbunsha.
- \_\_\_\_\_. 1980. *Japanese Religion in the Modern Century* / translated by H. Byron Earhart. Tokyo: University of Tokyo Press.
- \_\_\_\_\_. 1989. "Ofudesaki no rekishi-teki shisō-teki igi." *G-TEN* 42 (June 1989), 13-22.
- Nakajima Hideo. 1982. "Kosei to garyū shinkō no hazamade." *Arakitōryō* 128 (Summer 1982), 70-79.
- \_\_\_\_\_. 1983. "Between Individuality and Self-Styled Faith." *Tenri Journal of Religion* 17 (October 1983), 133-143.
- \_\_\_\_\_. 1994. "Genten kenkyū no kiseki." *Arakitōryō* 177 (Fall 1994), 20-29.
- Nakayama Shinnosuke. 1897. "Okina yori kikishi hanashi" (OYKH). reproduction/copy of handwritten text at Tenri Central Library (Tenri Toshokan)/ donated by Tenrikyō Kyōgi oyobi Shiryō Shūseibu. Print edition in *Arakitōryō* 149 (Fall 1987), 143-148.
- Nakayama Shōzen. 1936, 1946. *Hitokoto hanashi*, 3 vols. Tenri: Tenrikyō Dōyūsha.
- \_\_\_\_\_. 1951, 1957. *Zoku hitokoto hanashi*, 2 vols. Tenri: Tenrikyō Dōyūsha.
- \_\_\_\_\_. 1962. "Kiyō-han Ofudesaki no kenkyū." *Biblia (Biburia)* 23, 221-258.
- \_\_\_\_\_. 1964. *Hitokotohanashi* (English translation). Tenri: The Headquarters of Tenrikyo Church.
- \_\_\_\_\_. 1986 [1962, 1963, 1964, 1967]. "The Theory of Doctrine and the Practice of Faith." In *The Theological Perspectives of Tenrikyo: In Commemoration of the Centennial Anniversary of Oyasama* / edited by Oyasato Research Institute, Tenri University. Tenri: Tenri University Press, 3-28.

- \_\_\_\_\_. 1994. *Lectures on The Doctrine of Tenrikyo*. Tenri: Tenrikyo Overseas Mission Department.
- \_\_\_\_\_. 1999. *Dai jūrokkai kōgikōshūkai daiichiji kōshūroku bassui*. Tenri: Tenrikyō Dōyūsha.
- Nakayama Yoshikazu. 1986. *My Oyasama, volume two*. Tenri: Tenrikyo Overseas Mission Department. (translation of *Watashi no Oyasama*, below)
- \_\_\_\_\_. 1987 [1981]. *Watashi no Oyasama*. Tenri: Tenrikyō Dōyūsha.
- Nakayama Zenji. 2000. "Jiba e no shinkō shisei o tadasu koto ga taisetsu." *Michi no tomo* 110 no. 8 (August 2000), 6-9.
- \_\_\_\_\_. 2002. *Instruction Two*. Tenri: Translation Section, Tenrikyo Overseas Department.
- Nakayama, Zenye. 1979. *Guideposts*. Tenri: Tenrikyo Church Headquarters.
- Nihon shomin seikatsu shiryō shūsei, dai jū-hachi kan* (vol. 18): *minkan shūkyō* (NSSS) / edited by Miyamoto Tsuneichi, Hagaguchi Torao, and Higa Shunchō. 1983. Tokyo: San-ichi Shobō.
- Nishiyama Teruo. 1991. "Tenrikyō ni okeru seitō to itan: sono rironteki kōsatsu." *G-TEN* 60 (March 1991), 73-85.
- Oguchi Ichi and Takagi Hiroo. 1954. "Meiji shūkyō shakai shi." In *Shūkyō-hen* (vol. 6 of *Meiji bunka shi* series) / edited by Kishimoto Hideo. Tokyo: Yōyōsha, 439-535.
- Oguri Junko. 1969. *Nihon no kindai shakai to Tenrikyō*. Tokyo: Hyōronsha.
- \_\_\_\_\_. 1970. *Nakayama Miki: Tenrikyō*. Tokyo: Shinjinbutsu Ōraisha.
- Okuya Bunchi. 1936. *Tenri kyōso Nakayama Mikiko jitsuden / tsuketari Iburi Izō ō*. Tanbaichi, Nara: Kinoshita Shinshindō.
- Ōya, Wataru. 1996. *Tenrikyō no shiteki kenkyū*. Osaka: Tōhō Shuppan.
- Oyasato Research Institute, Tenri University, ed. 1986. *The Theological Perspectives of Tenrikyo: In Commemoration of the Centennial Anniversary of Oyasama*. Tenri: Tenri University Press.
- Parrinder, Geoffrey. 1987. "Charisma." In *The Encyclopedia of Religion* / editor in chief Mircea Eliade; edited by Charles J. Adams et al. New York: Macmillan, 3: 218-222.
- Pye, Michael. 1996. "Shinto, Primal Religion and International Identity." *Marburg Journal of Religion* 1 no. 1 (April 1996), 1-5.
- Reader, Ian and Tanabe, George J. Jr. 1994. Special Edition on Conflict and Religion in Japan: Editor's Introduction. *Japanese Journal of Religious Studies* 21 nos. 2-3 (June-September 1994), 123-135.
- \_\_\_\_\_. 1998. *Practically Religious: Worldly Benefits and the Common Religion of Japan*. Honolulu: University of Hawai'i Press.

- Roberts, Keith A. 2004. *Religion in Sociological Perspective* (fourth edition). Belmont, CA: Wadsworth.
- Rudolph, Kurt. 1987. "Heresy: An Overview" / translated by Matthew J. O'Connell. In *The Encyclopedia of Religion* / editor in chief Mircea Eliade; edited by Charles J. Adams et al. New York: Macmillan, 6: 269-275.
- Russell, Jeffrey Burton. 1987. "Heresy: Christian Concepts." In *The Encyclopedia of Religion* / editor in chief Mircea Eliade; edited by Charles J. Adams et al. New York: Macmillan, 6: 276-279.
- Sanders, E. P., ed. 1980-1982. *Jewish and Christian Self-Definition*, 3 vols. Philadelphia: Fortress Press.
- Sasada Katsuyuki. 1986. "Kaiki no genfūkei: ojibagaeri no igi." *G-TEN* 7 (February 1986), 63-69.
- . 1991. "Kihon shinjō to itan: Oyasama to Jiba o chūshin toshite." *G-TEN* 60 (March 1991), 58-65.
- Satō Kōji. 2004. *Omichi no jōshiki*. Tenri: Tenrikyō Dōyūsha.
- Sawai, Yoshitsugu. 1986. "The Providence of God the Parent: Toward the Understanding of Tenrikyo Cosmology." In *The Theological Perspectives of Tenrikyo: In Commemoration of the Centennial Anniversary of Oyasama* / edited by Oyasato Research Institute, Tenri University. Tenri: Tenri University Press, 79-110.
- Sekimori, Gaynor. 2002. "Shugendō: The State of the Field [review article]." *Monumenta Nipponica* 57 no. 2 (Summer 2002), 207-227.
- Serizawa Shigeru. 1982. "Garyū shinkō no shijitsu to shinkō no hansei." *Arakitōryō* 128 (Summer 1982), 34-45.
- . 1983. "Historical Facts Concerning Self-Styled Beliefs in Tenrikyo and Reflections Upon Our Faith." *Tenri Journal of Religion* 17 (October 1983), 145-158.
- Shimazono Susumu. 1977. "Kamigakari kara tasuke made: Tenrikyō no hassei jōsetsu." *Komazawa Daigaku Bukkyōgakubu ronshū* 8, 209-226.
- . 1979. "The Living Kami Idea in the New Religions of Japan." *Japanese Journal of Religious Studies* 6 no. 3 (September 1979), 389-412.
- . 1986. "The Development of Millennialistic Thought in Japan's New Religions: From Tenrikyō to Honmichi." In *New Religious Movements and Rapid Social Change* / edited by James A. Beckford. New York: UNESCO, 55-86.
- Shōgaku Tosho. ed. 1989. *Nihon hōgen daijiten*, 3 vols. Tokyo: Shōgakukan.
- Simmons, John K. 1991. "Charisma and Covenant: The Christian Science Movement in its Initial Postcharismatic Phase." In *When Prophets Die: The Postcharismatic Fate of New Religious Movements* / edited by Timothy Miller. Albany: State University of New York Press, 107-123.
- Stark, Rodney. 1987. "How New Religions Succeed: A Theoretical Model." In *The Future of New Religious Movements* / edited by David G. Bromley and Phillip E. Hammond. Macon, GA: Mercer University Press, 11-29.

- \_\_\_\_\_. 1996. "Why Religious Movements Succeed or Fail: A Revised General Model." *Journal of Contemporary Religions* 11 no. 2 (May 1996) 133-146.
- Stark, Rodney and Bainbridge, William Sims. 1985. *The Future of Religion: Secularization, Revival, and Cult Formation*. Berkeley & Los Angeles: University of California.
- \_\_\_\_\_. 1987. *A Theory of Religion*. New York: Peter Lang.
- Sugihara, Yoshie and Plath, David W. 1969. *Sensei and His People: The Building of a Japanese Commune*. Berkeley/Los Angeles/London: University of California Press.
- Takano Tomoji. 1983. *Shimizu Yonosuke denkō*. Tenri: Tenrikyō Dōyūsha.
- \_\_\_\_\_. 1991. *Kaitei go-han Tenrikyō shi sankō nenpyō*. Tenri: Yōtokusha.
- \_\_\_\_\_. 2001 [1971]. *Gozonmei no koro*. Tenri: Tenrikyō Dōyūsha.
- Tanabe Kyōichi. 2002. "Kyōkai no setsuritsu oyobi kyōha dokuritsu (part 2)." *Arakitōryō* 209 (Fall 2002), 82-105.
- Teeuwen, Mark and Rambelli, Fabio. 2003. *Buddhas and Kami in Japan: Honji Suijaku as a Combinatory Paradigm*. London/New York: RoutledgeCurzon.
- Teeuwen, Mark and Scheid, Bernhard. 2002. "Tracing Shinto in the History of Kami Worship: Editor's Introduction." *Japanese Journal of Religious Studies* (Nagoya) 29, nos. 3-4 (Fall 2002), 195-207.
- Tenri Daigaku Oyasato Kenkyūsho, ed. 1989. *Kaitei Tenrikyō jiten: kyōkaishi-hen* (TJKH). Tenri: Tenrikyō Dōyūsha.
- \_\_\_\_\_, ed. 1997. *Kaitei Tenrikyō jiten* (TJ). Tenri: Tenrikyō Dōyūsha.
- Tenri Daigaku Shūkyō Bunka Kenkyūsho, ed. 1955. *Tenrikyō kyōkai shi shiryō* (TKSS), 8 vols. Tenri: Tenri Daigaku Shuppanbu.
- Tenri Toshokan, ed. 1959. *Tenrikyō tosho no mokuroku: Shōwa sanjūsan-nen jūnigatsu genzai*. Tenri: Tenri Daigaku Shuppanbu.
- \_\_\_\_\_, ed. 1974. *Omichi senjin denki bon mokuroku: Shōwa yonjūku-nen gogatsu genzai*. Tenri: Tenri Toshokan.
- \_\_\_\_\_, ed. 1975. *Tenrikyō kyōkai shi shomoku: Shōwa gojū-nen sangatsu genzai*. Tenri: Tenri Toshokan.
- Tenrikyo Church Headquarters. 1976. *Anecdotes of Oyasama the Foundress of Tenrikyo* (A). Tenri: Tenrikyo Church Headquarters. (translation of IH, Tenrikyō Kyōkai Honbu, ed. below)
- \_\_\_\_\_. 1993. *The Doctrine of Tenrikyo* (D) (tenth edition). Tenri: Tenrikyo Church Headquarters. (translation of TK, Tenrikyō Kyōkai Honbu, ed. below)
- \_\_\_\_\_. 1996 [1967]. *Life of Oyasama, the Foundress of Tenrikyo* (LO) (third edition). Tenri: Tenrikyo Church Headquarters. (translation of KTK, Tenrikyō Kyōkai Honbu, ed. below)

- \_\_\_\_\_. 1998. *Ofudesaki: English, Japanese and Romanization* (Of). Tenri: Tenrikyo Church Headquarters.
- Tenrikyō Dōyūsha, ed. 1994. *Kanrodai monogatari*. Tenri: Tenrikyō Dōyūsha.
- \_\_\_\_\_, ed. 1995. *Honbu-in kyōwa sho: Meiji-Taishō ki sanjūyo-nin no kyūjū hen*. Tenri: Tenrikyō Dōyūsha.
- \_\_\_\_\_, ed. 1997. *Ten no jōgi: Honseki, Iburi Izō no shōgai*. Tenri: Tenrikyō Dōyūsha.
- \_\_\_\_\_, ed. 2002. *Yōboku handobukku*. Tenri: Tenrikyō Dōyūsha.
- Tenrikyō Kyōgi oyobi Shiryō Shūseibu, ed. 1963-1965. *Osashizu* (Os) (fourth edition), 7 vols. Tenri: Nakayama Shōzen; Tenri Jihōsha.
- \_\_\_\_\_, ed. 1982, 1985, 1987. *Osashizu sakuin*, 3 vols. Tenri: Tenrikyō Kyōgi oyobi Shiryō Shūseibu.
- \_\_\_\_\_, ed. 2001 [1963]. *Nakayama Shinnosuke den* (NSD) (tenth printing). Tenri: Tenrikyō Dōyūsha.
- Tenrikyō Kyōkai Honbu, ed. 1997a [1956]. *Kōhon Tenrikyō Kyōsoden* (KTK) (thirty-ninth printing). Tenri: Tenrikyō Dōyūsha.
- \_\_\_\_\_, ed. 1997b [1949]. *Tenrikyō kyōten* (seventy-sixth printing). Tenri: Tenrikyō Dōyūsha.
- \_\_\_\_\_, ed. 1998 [1976]. *Kōhon Tenrikyō Kyōsoden itsuwa-hen* (IH) (twenty-sixth printing). Tenri: Tenrikyō Dōyūsha.
- \_\_\_\_\_, ed. 1999 [1928]. *Ofudesaki chūshaku*. Tenri: Tenri Jihōsha.
- Tenrikyo Overseas Department (TOD). 2000. *Reference materials for The Life of Oyasama*. Tenri: Tenrikyo Overseas Department.
- \_\_\_\_\_. 2003. *The Constitution of Tenrikyo* (third edition). Tenri: Tenrikyo Overseas Department.
- Tenrikyō Omotetōryōshitsu Chōsaka. 1981. *Tenrikyō kyōkai meishōroku, Shōwa gojūroku-nen han*. Tenri: Tenrikyō Kyōkai Honbu.
- Tenrikyō Omotetōryōshitsu Chōsajōhōka. 2002. *Tenrikyō kyōkai meishōroku, rikkyō rokujū go nen han*. Tenri: Tenrikyō Kyōkai Honbu.
- Tenrikyo Overseas Mission Department (TOMD). 1979. *The Catechism of Tenrikyo*. Tenri: Tenrikyo Overseas Mission Department.
- \_\_\_\_\_. 1990. *Selections from the Osashizu* (revised edition). Tenri: Tenrikyo Overseas Mission Department.
- \_\_\_\_\_. 1998. *Tenrikyo: The Path to Joyousness*. Tenri: Tenrikyo Overseas Mission Department.
- Tenrikyō Seinenkai Kyōgaku Kenkyū Yūshikai. 1987. "Genten ni miru kihon kyōri saikō (zadankai)." *Arakitōryō* 149 (Fall 1987), 265-281.



- Tenrikyō Seinenkai Shiryōchōsa-han. 1987. "Kyōsoden shiryō no kentō: Nakayama Miki kenkyū nōto hihan" (KNH). *Arakitōryō* 149 (Fall 1987), 22-264.
- Tenrikyō Takayasu Daikyōkai shi (TTDS) (revised edition). 1989 [1926]. Osaka: Tenrikyō Takayasu Daikyōkai.
- Toyoshima Yasukuni. 1999. *Tenri no reinōsha: Nakayama Miki to shinjin gunzō*. Ōmiya, Saitama: Information Shuppanyoku.
- Thal, Sarah. 2002. "Redefining the Gods: Politics and Survival in the Creation of Modern Kami." *Japanese Journal of Religious Studies* 29, nos. 3-4 (Fall 2002), 379-404.
- Tsushima, Michihito. 1991. "Emperor and World Renewal in the New Religions: The Case of Shinsei Ryūjinkai." In *New Religions* / translated by Norman Havens. Tokyo: Institute for Japanese Culture and Classics, Kokugakuin University, 58-92.
- Tyler, Royall. 1989. "Kōfuku-ji and Shugendō." *Japanese Journal of Religious Studies* 16/2-3 (June-September 1989), 143-180.
- Ueda Hirakazu. 2001. "Dokuritsu undō no naka no kami-ichijō no oboshimeshi." *Yōki* 632 (December 2001), 48-52.
- \_\_\_\_\_. 2002. "Naimushō no kunrei (parts 1-5)." *Yōki* 640-644 (August-December 2002), 38-41; 40-43; 44-47; 48-51; 64-68.
- \_\_\_\_\_. 2003a. "Naimushō no kunrei (part 6)." *Yōki* 645 (January 2003), 43-47.
- \_\_\_\_\_. 2003b. "Naimushō kunrei no eikyō (parts 1 and 2)." *Yōki* 646-647 (February and March 2003), 48-51; 49-53.
- \_\_\_\_\_. 2003c. "Ando jiken--Iida Iwajirō no itan jijō (parts 1-3)." *Yōki* 648-650 (April-June 2003), 54-58; 47-51; 52-55.
- \_\_\_\_\_. 2003d. "Hashimoto/Maegawa no rihan (parts 1 and 2)." *Yōki* 651-652 (July and August 2003), 48-51; 53-57.
- \_\_\_\_\_. 2003e. "Ippa dokuritsu no undō (parts 1-4)." *Yōki* 653-656 (September-December 2003), 73-75; 56-59; 76-79; 53-55.
- \_\_\_\_\_. 2004a. "Ippa dokuritsu no undō (part 5)." *Yōki* 657 (January 2004), 33-37.
- \_\_\_\_\_. 2004b. "Osashizu ni haisuru: Besseki seido no kakuritsu to sono oboshimeshi." *Arakitōryō* 214 (Winter 2004), 62-77.
- \_\_\_\_\_. 2004c. "Dai-ikkai seigan (parts 1-6)." *Yōki* 658-663 (February-July 2004), 63-65; 47-49; 31-35; 79-83; 74-77; 43-48.
- \_\_\_\_\_. 2004d. "Ippa dokuritsu undō ni shitagau naiyō no jūjitsu: kyōgi seibi to kyōsoden." *Yōki* 664 (August 2004), 48-51.
- \_\_\_\_\_. 2004e. "Ippa dokuritsu undō ni shitagau naiyō no jūjitsu: kyōgi seibi / Mikagura-uta." *Yōki* 665 (September 2004), 48-51.
- \_\_\_\_\_. 2004f. "Ippa dokuritsu undō ni shitagau naiyō no jūjitsu: kyōgi seibi Ofudesaki / kyōten." *Yōki* 666 (October 2004), 41-45.

- \_\_\_\_\_. 2004g. "Ippa dokuritsu undō ni shitagau naiyō no jūjitsu: kyōgi seibi / Meiji Kyōten ni tsuite." *Yōki* 667 (November 2004), 80-85.
- \_\_\_\_\_. 2004h. "Ippa dokuritsu undō ni shitagau naiyō no jūjitsu: kyōgi seibi / kamina no henshen." *Yōki* 668 (December 2004), 39-43.
- Ueda Ritarō. 1956. *Masuno Kosetsu sensei: sono shinkō to shōgai*. Osaka: Daiichi Insatsu Shuppan.
- Ueda Yoshinaru. 1950. *Itan ni taisuru hihan*. Tanbaichi, Nara: Tenrikyō Kyōmuchō.
- Uemura Fukutarō. 1976. *Shio o fuku: Tenrikyō kyōkai ryakushi*, 3 vols. Tenri: Tenrikyō Dōyūsha.
- Umehara Masaki. 1974. *Minshū shūkyō no sekai*. Tokyo: Gendai Shokan.
- \_\_\_\_\_. 1975. *Honmichi: minshū shūkyō no genshō*. Tokyo: Shirakawa Shoin.
- \_\_\_\_\_. 1977. *Tenkeisha no shūkyō Honmichi*. Tokyo: Kōdōsha.
- \_\_\_\_\_. 1978. "Honmichi: Kanrodai sekai e no michi," In *Shinshūkyō no sekai*, vol. 4. Tokyo: Daizō Shuppan.
- Wagner, Sean. 1997. *Tenrikyo: The Establishment and Legitimization of Sacred Space in Tenri City, Japan*. M.A. thesis, University of Hawai'i at Mānoa.
- Weber, Max. 1947. *The Theory of Social and Economic Organization* / translated by A.M. Henderson and Talcott Parsons, ed. New York: Oxford University Press.
- \_\_\_\_\_. 1963. *The Sociology of Religion* / translated by Ephraim Fischhoff. Boston: Beacon Press.
- \_\_\_\_\_. 1968. *Max Weber on Charisma and Institution Building; selected papers* / edited by S. N. Eisenstadt. Chicago/London: The University of Chicago Press.
- \_\_\_\_\_. 1978. *Economy and Society: An Outline of Interpretive Sociology*, 2 vols. / edited by Guenther Roth and Clause Wittich. Berkeley/Los Angeles/London: University of California Press.
- White, James W. 1995. *Ikki: Social Conflict and Political Protest in Early Modern Japan*. Ithaca: Cornell University Press.
- Williams, Duncan Ryūken. 2000. Re-presenting Zen: A Study of Sōtō Zen During the Edo Period. Ph.D. dissertation, Harvard University.
- Yamashita, Akiko. 1990. "Tenrin-ō and Henjō-Nansi: Two Women--Founders of New Religions." *Japanese Religions* 16 no 2 (July 1990), 1-23.
- \_\_\_\_\_. 1998. "The 'Eschatology' of Japanese New and New New Religions: From Tenri-kyō to Kōfuku no Kagaku." *Japanese Religions* 23 (January 1998), 125-142.
- Yamamoto Kunio and Nakajima Hideo. 1987 [1977]. *Osashizu kenkyū*, 2 vols. Tenri: Tenrikyō Dōyūsha.
- Yamazawa Ryōsuke. 1974 [1881]. *Doroumi kōki, Meiji jūyo-nen wakatai-bon* (DK). In *Honmichi fukei jiken* by Murakami Shigeyoshi. Tokyo: Kōdansha, 260-268.

- Yamazawa Tametsugu. 1998 [1949]. *Otefuri gaiyō*. Tenri: Tenrikyō Dōyūsha.
- Yamochi Tatsuzō. 1982. "Garyū shinkō no kiban." *Arakitōryō* 128 (Summer 1982), 46-57.
- \_\_\_\_\_. 1984. *Kōhon Tenrikyō kyōsoden nyūmon jukō*. Tenri: Tenrikyō Dōyūsha.
- \_\_\_\_\_. 1993. "Dame no oshie no tenkai to Shinbashira no ri." *Arakitōryō* 173 (Fall 1993), 34-41.
- \_\_\_\_\_. 1994. "Osashizu haidoku no kokoroe." *Arakitōryō* 177 (Fall 1994), 42-53.
- Yashima Hideo. 1987. *Nakayama Miki kenkyū nōto*. Tokyo: Rippu Shobō.
- Yasui Mikio. 1989. "Itan no kōzu." *Arakitōryō* 154 (Winter 1989), 62-75.
- \_\_\_\_\_. 1993. "Shinbashira: sono kyōri to shinkō." *Arakitōryō* 173 (Fall 1993), 20-33.
- Yoboku Handbook* (second edition). 1997. Tenri: Tenrikyo Yoboku Association.
- Yumiyama Tatsuya. 1991. "Shūmatsu-teki shūkyō undō no zasetsu to henyō: Honmichi ikō no Tenrikyō-kei kyōdan." *Kokugaku-in Daigaku Nihon Bunka Kenkyūjo kiyō* 67 (March 1991), 39-72.